328RL
1007
.1006

THE

BENGAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

PROCEEDINGS.

Official Report.

SECOND SESSION.

1921.

VOLUME II.

April 20th and 21st, 1921.

CALCUTTA:
Bengal Secretariat Book Depôt
1921

GOVERNMENT OF BENGAL.

GOVERNOR OF BENGAL.

His Excellency the Right Hon'ble LAWRENCE JOHN LUMLEY DUNDAS, Earl of Ronaldshay, G.C.I.E.

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

The Hon'ble SIR HENRY WHEELER, K.C.S.I., K.C.I.E., C.S.I., Vice-President, in charge of the following portfolios:

1. Appointment
2. Political
3. Police.
4. Ecclesiastical
5. European Education

The Hon'ble SIR BIJAY CHAND MAHTAB, K.C.S.I., K.C.I.E., I.O.M., Maharajadhiraja Bahadur of Burdwan in charge of the following portfolios:—

1. Land Revenue
2. Land Acquisition.
3. Forests
4. Irrigation.
5. Excluded areas

The Hon'ble Mr. J. H. KEYE, C.S.I., C.I.E., in charge of the following portfolios:

1. Finance.
2. Separate Revenue
3. Commerce and reserved Industrial subjects
4. Marine

The Hon'ble SIR ABDUR-RAHIM, KT., in charge of the following portfolios:

1. Judicial
2. Jails.
3. Emigration.
4. Immigration
5. Jurisdiction.

MINISTERS.

The Hon'ble Sir Surendra Nath Banerjea, Kt., in charge of the following portfolios:—

Local Self-Government and Public Health.

The Hon'ble Mr. Provash Chunder Mitter, C.I.E., in charge of the following portfolio:—

Education.

The Hon'ble the Nawab Sayid Nawab Ali Chaudhuri, Khan Bahadur, C.I.E., in charge of the following portfolios:—

Agriculture and Public Works.

GOVERNMENT OF BENGAL.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE BENGAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

PRESIDENT

The Hon'ble Nawab Sir Syed Shams-ul-Huda, K.C.I.E.

DEPUTY-PRESIDENT

Babu Surendra Nath Ray.

Secretary to the Council—C. Tindall, C.I.E., I.C.S.

Assistant Secretary to the Council—A. M. Hutchison.

Registrar to the Council—J. W. McKay.

BENGAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS.

A

Addy, Babu Amulya Dhone. (Bengal National Chamber of Commerce.)
Afzal, Khan Bahadur Nawabzada K. M. (Dacca City (Muhammadan).)
Ahmed, Khan Bahadur Maulvi Wasimuddin. (Pabna (Muhammadan).)
Ahmed, Maulvi Azaharuddin. (Bakarganj West (Muhammadan).)
Ahmed, Maulvi Emaduddin. (Rajshahi South (Muhammadan).)
Ahmed, Maulvi Mesbah Uddin. (Faridpur South (Muhammadan).)
Ahmed, Maulvi Rafi Uddin. (Jessore South (Muhammadan).)
Ahmed, Maulvi Yakuinuddin. (Dinajpur (Muhammadan).)
Ahmed, Munshi Jafar. (Noakhali (Muhammadan).)
Ali, Maulvi A. H. M. Wazir. (Bakarganj North (Muhammadan).)
Ali, Maulvi Syed Muksood. (24-Parganas Municipal North (Muhammadan).)
Ali, Mr. Syed Eitar. (Nadia (Muhammadan).)
Ali, Mr. Syed Nasim. (24-Parganas Rural (Muhammadan).)
Ali, Munshi Amir. (Chittagong (Muhammadan).)
Ali, Munshi Ayub. (Chittagong (Muhammadan).)
Arhamuddin, Maulvi Khandakar. (Mymensingh West (Muhammadan).)
Azam, Khan Bahadur Khwaja Mohamed. (Dacca East Rural (Muhammadan).)

B

Banerjea, the Hon'ble Sir Surendra Nath. (Minister, 24-Parganas Municipal (Non-Muhammadan).)
Banerjee, Rai Bahadur Abinash Chandra. (Birbhum (Non-Muhammadan).)
Barma, Rai Sahib Panchanan. (Rangpur (Non-Muhammadan).)
Barton, Mr. H. (Anglo-Indian.)
Basu, Babu Jatindra Nath. (Calcutta North (Non-Muhammadan).)
Basu, Rai Bahadur Nalinaksha. (Burdwan (Non-Muhammadan).)
Bhattacharji, Babu Hem Chandra. (Nominated Non-Official (Labouring Classes).)
Birla, Babu Ghanshyam Das. (Nominated Non-Official.)
Birley, Mr. L. (Nominated Official.)
Bompas, Mr. C. H. (Nominated Official.)
Bose, Mr. S. M. (Mymensingh East (Non-Muhammadan).)

C

Campbell, Mr. J. (Bengal Chamber of Commerce.)
Carey, Mr. W. L. (Indian Mining Association.)

Cathcart, Mr. M. [Dacca and Chittagong (European).]
Charmakar, Babu Rasik Chandra. [Noakhali (Non-Muhammadan).]
Chaudhuri, Babu Kishori Mohan. [Rajshahi (Non-Muhammadan).]
Chaudhuri, Babu Tankanath. [Dinajpur (Non-Muhammadan).]
Chaudhuri, Khan Bahadur Maulvi Hafizar Rahman. [Bogra (Muhammadan).]
Chaudhuri, Maulvi Shah Muhammad. [Malda *cum* Jalpaiguri (Muhammadan).]
Chaudhuri, Rai Harendranath. [24-Parganas Rural North (Non-Muhammadan).]
Chaudhuri, Sir Ashutosh. [Bogra *cum* Pabna (Non-Muhammadan).]
Chaudhuri, the Hon'ble the Nawab Sayed Nawab Ali, Khan Bahadur. [Minister. Mymensingh East. Muhammadan.]
Cochran, Mr. A. [Bengal Chamber of Commerce.]
Cohen, Mr. D. J. [Calcutta South Central (Non-Muhammadan).]

D

Das, Babu Bhishmadev. [Nominated Non-official. Depressed Classes.]
Das, Mr. S. R. [Calcutta North West (Non-Muhammadan).]
Das, Rai Bahadur Amar Nath. [Nominated Official.]
Das Gupta, Babu Nibaran Chandra. [Bakarganj North (Non-Muhammadan).]
Dey, Babu Lalmohan Lal. [Hooghly *cum* Howrah Rural (Non-Muhammadan).]
Dey, Mr. G. G. [Nominated Official.]
Donald, Mr. J. [Nominated Official.]
Doss, Rai Bahadur Pyari Lal. [Dacca City (Non-Muhammadan).]
Dutt, Mr. Atoy Chunder. [Bankura East (Non-Muhammadan).]
Dutt, Rai Bahadur Dr. Hari Dhan. [Calcutta North Central (Non-Muhammadan).]
Dutta, Babu Annada Charan. [Chittagong (Non-Muhammadan).]
Dutta, Babu Indu Bhushan. [Tippera (Non-Muhammadan).]

F

Faroqui, K. G. M. [Tippera (Muhammadan).]
Forrester, Mr. J. Campbell. [Presidency and Burdwan (European).]

G

Ghatak, Rai Sahib Nibaran. [Malda (Non-Muhammadan).]
Ghose, Mr. D. C. [24-Parganas Rural South (Non-Muhammadan).]
Ghose, Rai Bahadur Jogendra Chunder. [Calcutta University.]
Gordon, Mr. A. D. [Indian Tea Association.]
Gupta, Mr. N. B. [Nominated Official.]

H

Haq, Maulvi A. K. Fazlul (Khulna (Muhammadan).)
Haq, Shah Syed Emdadul (Tippera (Muhammadan).)
Hopkyns, Mr. W. S. (Nominated Official.)
Hornell, Mr. W. W. (Nominated Official.)
Huq, Maulvi Ekramul (Murshidabad (Muhammadan).)
Hussain, Maulvi Md. Mahmud (Burdwan Division North (Muhammadan).)

J

James, Mr. R. H. L. Longford (Indian Jute Mills Association.)
Janah, Babu Sarat Chandra (Midnapore South (Non-Muhammadan).)

K

Karim, Maulvi Abdul (Rangpur North (Muhammadan).)
Karim, Maulvi Fazal (Bakarganj South (Muhammadan).)
Kerr, the Hon'ble Mr. J. H. (Member, Executive Council.)
Khan, Maulvi Hamidudda (Rangpur East (Muhammadan).)
Khan, Maulvi Md. Rahim Baksh (Mymensingh East (Muhammadan).)
Khan, Mr. Razaur Rahman (Calcutta North (Muhammadan).)
Khan, Babu Debendra Lal (Midnapore North (Non-Muhammadan).)
Khan Chaudhuri, Khan Bahadur Maulvi Md. Ershad Ali (Rajshahi North (Muhammadan).)

L

Lang, Mr. J. (Nominated Official.)
Larmour, Mr. F. A. (Calcutta Trades Association.)
Law, Raja Reshee Case (Bengal National Chamber of Commerce.)
Lees, Mr. D. H. (Nominated Official.)

M

Maharajadhiraja Bahadur of Burdwan, the Hon'ble (Member, Executive Council.)
Maitra, Dr. Jatindra Nath (Rangpur North (Non-Muhammadan).)
Makramah, Munshi (Noakhali (Muhammadan).)
Marr, Mr. A. (Nominated Official.)
McKenzie, Mr. D. P. (Indian Jute Mills Association.)
Mitra, Rai Bahadur Mahendra Chandra (Hooghly Municipal (Non-Muhammadan).)
Mitter, the Hon'ble Mr. Provash Chunder (Minister, Presidency Landholders.)
Morgan, Mr. G. (Bengal Chamber of Commerce.)

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS.

Mukharji, Babu Satish Chandra [Hooghly *cum* Howrah Rural (Non-Muhammadan.)]

Mukherjee, Babu Nitya Dhon. [Howrah Municipalities (Non-Muhammadan.)]

Mukherji, Professor S. C. (Nominated Non-Official The Indian Christian Community.)

Mukhopadhaya, Babu Sarat Chandra. [Midnapore South (Non-Muhammadan.)]

Mullick, Babu Nirode Behary [Bakarganj South (Non-Muhammadan.)]

Mullick, Babu Surendra Nath [Calcutta South (Non-Muhammadan).]

N

Nakey, Mirza Muhammad Ali [24-Parganas Municipal South (Muhammadan.)]

Nasker, Babu Hem Chandra [24-Parganas Rural Central (Non-Muhammadan.)]

O

O'Kinealy, Lt. Col. Frederick (Nominated Official.)

O'Malley, Mr. L. S. S. (Nominated Official.)

P

Pahlowan, Maulvi Md. Abdul Jubbar [Mymensingh West (Muhammadan.)]

Pal, Rai Bahadur Radha Charan [Calcutta East (Non-Muhammadan.)]

Payne, Mr. C. F. (Nominated Official.)

Poddar, Babu Keshoram (Bengal Marwari Association.)

Pugh, Colonel A. J. [Presidency and Burdwan (European.)]

R

Ray, Mr. W. R. [Presidency and Burdwan (European.)]

Raheem, Mr. Abdur (Nominated Non-Official.)

Rahim, the Hon'ble Sir Abdur (Member, Executive Council.)

Raikat, Mr. Prasanna Deb [Jalpaiguri (Non-Muhammadan).]

Rauf, Maulvi Shah Abdur [Rangpur West (Muhammadan).]

Ray, Babu Bhabendra Chandra [Jessore North (Non-Muhammadan).]

Ray, Babu Surendra Nath [Deputy President, 24-Parganas Municipal South (Non-Muhammadan).]

Ray, Kumar Shib Shekhareswar. (Rajshahi Landholders.)

Ray, Rai Bahadur Upendra Lal. (Chittagong Landholders.)

Ray Chaudhuri, Babu Brojendra Kishor. (Dacca Landholders.)

Ray Chaudhuri, Mr. Krishna Chandra. (Nominated Non-Official Labouring Classes.)

Ray Choudhury, Raja Manmatha Nath. [Mymensingh West (Non-Muhammadan).]
Rhodes, Mr. C. W. (Bengal Chamber of Commerce.)
Roy, Babu Jogendra Krishna. [Faridpur South (Non-Muhammadan).]
Roy, Babu Jogendra Nath. [Dacca Rural (Non-Muhammadan).]
Roy, Babu Nalini Nath. [Jessore South (Non-Muhammadan).]
Roy, Maharaja Bahadur Kshaunish Chandra. [Nadia (Non-Muhammadan).]
Roy, Mr. J. E. (Bengal Chamber of Commerce.)
Roy, Mr. Tarit Bhusan. (Bengal Mahajan Sabha.)
Roy, Rai Bahadur Lalit Mohan Singh. (Burdwan Landholders.)
Roy, Raja Manilall Singh. [Burdwan (Non-Muhammadan).]
Roy Chaudhuri, Babu Sailaja Nath. [Khulna (Non-Muhammadan).]

S

Salam, Khan Bahadur Abdus. [Jessore North (Muhammadan).]
Sarkar, Babu Jogesh Chandra. [Rangpur (Non-Muhammadan).]
Sarkar, Babu Rishindra Nath. [Bankura West (Non-Muhammadan).]
Sinha, Babu Surendra Narayan. [Murshidabad (Non-Muhammadan).]
Stark, Mr. H. A. (Anglo-Indian.)
Suhrawardy, Dr. A. [Dacca West Rural (Muhammadan).]
Suhrawardy, Dr. Hassan. [Hooghly *cum* Howrah Municipal (Muhammadan).]
Suhrawardy, Mr. H. S. [Burdwan Division South (Muhammadan).]
Swan, Mr. J. A. L. (Nominated Official.)

T

Travers, Mr. W. L. [Rajshahi (European).]

W

Watson-Smyth, Mr. R. M. (Bengal Chamber of Commerce.)
Wheeler, the Hon'ble Sir Henry. (Member, Executive Council.)
Wordsworth, Mr. W. C. (Nominated Official.)

THE BENGAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS.

(Official Report of the Second Session.)

VOLUME II.

Proceedings of the Bengal Legislative Council assembled under the provisions of the Government of India Act.

THE Council met in the Council Chamber in the Town Hall, Calcutta, on Wednesday, the 29th April, 1921, at 3 P.M.

Present:

The Hon'ble the President, the Hon'ble the four Members of the Executive Council, the Hon'ble the three Ministers and 111 nominated and elected members.

Nomination of Panel of four Chairmen.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon'ble Nawab Sir Syed Shams-ul-Huda): In accordance with the provisions of section 9 rule 30 of the Bengal Legislative Council Rules, I hereby nominate the following members of the Legislative Council to constitute a panel of four chairmen for this session, viz.

Sir Ashutosh Chaudhuri
Mr. R. M. Watson-Smith
Rai Radha Charan Pal Bahadur
Maulvi A. K. Fazlul Haq

Certificates issued by the Governor under section 72 D (2) of the Government of India Act.

MEMBER in charge of DEPARTMENT of FINANCE (the Hon'ble Mr. Kerr): In accordance with the provisions of section 72 of the Bengal Legislative Council Rules, I beg to lay on the table a statement showing the action taken by His Excellency the Governor in regard to two budget grants. In one case, His Excellency, under proviso (b) section 72 D (2) of the Government of India Act, has authorised the expenditure of Rs. 10,000 as a case of emergency. This sum is necessary for the payment of salaries and contingencies for March and April

in connection with the work of the partition of Mymensingh. As His Excellency told the Council the other day, it has been decided to stop operations in Mymensingh, and instructions have been issued to the Public Works Department to close down operations as economically as possible. Meanwhile a certain number of officers have to be employed on the arrangement for closing down and there will be contractors' bills and other claims to meet. The other order is a similar one in respect of the partition of the district of Midnapore authorising an expenditure of Rs. 10,000. The case of Midnapore is still under the consideration of Government.

PARTITION OF MYMENSINGH.

Under proviso (b) to section 72D (2) of the Government of India Act I hereby authorise as a case of emergency the expenditure of Rs. 10,000 which is necessary for the payment due for the months of March and April 1921 of the salaries and allowances of the officers and establishment employed on the works of the partition of Mymensingh district and of the contingent expenditure connected with the Public Works Department officers controlling these works.

RONALDSHAY,
Governor of Bengal.

The 8th April 1921.

PARTITION OF MIDNAPORE.

Under proviso (b) to section 72D (2) of the Government of India Act I hereby authorise as a case of emergency the expenditure of Rs. 10,000 which is necessary for the payment due for the months of March and April 1921, of the salaries and allowances of the officers and establishment employed on the works of the partition of Midnapore district and of the contingent expenditure connected with the Public Works Department officers controlling these works.

RONALDSHAY,
Governor of Bengal.

The 8th April 1921.

Motions for supplementary grants.

22—General Administration.

MEMBER in charge of POLITICAL DEPARTMENT (the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler) moved "that the sum of Rs. 57,000 be granted as a supplementary grant for expenditure, under the head 22—General Administration, during the year 1921-22, and to ask for sanction to the transfer of Rs. 8,000 out of the above sum to the head 14—Civil Works-Public Works Department."

In connection with this matter I think a note has already been circulated to members of the Council, and that note contains the facts. Out of this grant of Rs. 57,000 which is now asked for, the most important

item is the amount of rent due to the Corporation in respect of the Chamber which we are now occupying. An agreement was come to with the Corporation on the matter of rent, and they have charged us from the date that we first came into occupation for the purpose of carrying out the necessary alterations and repairs. The yearly rent is Rs. 32,632 and the sum due for last year is Rs. 16,250. I am inclined to think that the Corporation has made a good bargain out of us, but we wanted the Town Hall, and therefore we had to accede to their terms. This sum would have been included in the budget in the ordinary way, and the Legislative Department is not to blame for not having done so, they did make a requisition, but unfortunately it was burnt in the fire which occurred at Writers' Buildings, and was overlooked.

The other small items are mainly on account of the rearrangement of seats, as we see them to-day, and minor alterations, as also for extra fans which were found necessary in the office.

The motion was put and agreed to.

26—Police.

MEMBER in charge of POLICE DEPARTMENT (the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler) moved "that the sum of Rs. 22,97,700 be granted as a supplementary grant for expenditure under the head '26-Police,' during the year 1921-22."

The circumstances under which this supplementary grant is being asked for, are known to the members of this Council. As will be remembered, when the original police vote was under discussion a reduction to the extent of some Rs. 24 lakhs was voted. Subsequently the matter was raised again, and it was stated on behalf of Government that were effect to be given to that vote, as it stood, it would be necessary either to reduce the number of the police or to reduce the pay given to them, either one or the other or both. On that statement, there was further discussion, in the course of which various opinions were expressed by different members to the effect that it would be well if the Council were again given an opportunity of examining the matter, in case their previous action had been based on any misconception of the facts or failure to appreciate the full facts. His Excellency the Governor, in the light of that debate, decided that he would not exercise the powers given to him under the law of dealing with the eventuality that had arisen but would allow a supplementary grant to be moved in this Council as early as possible during the current financial year, and accordingly I am here to-day to move this supplementary grant.

The reduction which was made by the Council in the original vote, was in the nature of a lump sum; the mover of that amendment did not pretend to distribute the lump sum over detailed heads, and we were equally unable to do so. Consequently, the vote which I am moving

to-day is similarly in the form of a lump sum, though less than the original reduction by Rs. 35,000, which we found on further examination of the papers to have been a double entry in the original budget. Being a lump sum, it is necessary in order to appreciate the nature of it, to study the budget as a whole, and the bearing of this sum in relation to the general expenditure on the police can best be judged of by comparing the budget under police for 1920-21 with the budget as we propose it for the current year. In order to facilitate that comparison, we have circulated to members of Council this printed note, which explains the difference under each head, while attached to each are given brief explanations. The total difference between these two budget amounts is Rs. 40,53,000 and the broad contention which I put to the Council on behalf of Government is that out of this difference we cannot economise this sum of Rs. 22,97,700 which I now ask for, and which I therefore ask the Council to restore to us. Our argument is that after examining these comparisons, as a whole, there is no room for an economy of that magnitude without, as I have said before, either reducing the number of the police or cutting the rates of pay given to them, neither being a step which Government is prepared to take, nor a step which, I venture to think, the Council would wish us to take. If our main contention that this economy cannot be effected is established, I submit that we are entitled to ask for this vote, but before proceeding to the details of this vote, I would refer again, it is necessarily a repetition of what I have already said, to the general considerations which necessitate this growth of expenditure upon the police.

At an earlier meeting of this Council, I put it to the members that, judged by numbers, the police force in Bengal is not of excessive size, and I would again remind the Council that, calculating on the basis of population and area, on the figures taken in 1918, we have only one superior officer (either a member of the Imperial Police or a deputy superintendent) to 367,000 people and 607 square miles, while we have only one subordinate officer to 2,014 people and 3·3 square miles, understanding by a subordinate officer everybody from the rank of inspector to constable. I maintain that this proportion *prima facie* shows that, looking to the size of the province, the force is not excessive in numbers, a contention which can also be established by comparison with other provinces, as these proportions of population and area are larger in Bengal than in any other province except Bihar and Orissa. So much for numbers.

As regards pay, we have in recent years, and last year in particular, found it necessary to raise the pay of the police, just as we and all other provinces have found it necessary to raise the pay of so many other services. Perhaps some members will have noticed in the papers two or three days ago, that a police scheme has been put forward in the United Provinces involving an increased expenditure of Rs. 34 lakhs,

while, equally, members may have noticed recently in the papers a lecture given by Sir John Cumming in London, in which he maintained and showed that the cost of the police force in India was by no means excessive compared with the expenditure in other countries. In connection with these increases in pay, I gave details at the time of the original budget for the district police. I shall have to give further details in connection with various amendments of which notice has been given, but in order to illustrate my point—in case it is again alleged that sufficient detail has not been laid before the Council—I will give a few examples from Calcutta.

Taking Calcutta, prior to 1917 we had constables on Rs. 11 rising to Rs. 14; in that year we had to raise their pay to Rs. 13 to Rs. 16; in September 1920 we had to raise the pay to Rs. 14 to Rs. 18, and that being found inadequate, in November we had to raise the pay to Rs. 18 to Rs. 22, a rate which I put it to the Council, is in no sense excessive. Similarly, taking head constables in Calcutta, in 1914 the rates of pay given to them were Rs. 18, 21, and 26. In 1920 we had to raise the pay for some to Rs. 25 rising to Rs. 35, and for others to Rs. 30 rising to Rs. 50. Sergeants, who in 1919 were allowed Rs. 125 rising to Rs. 175, in 1920 had to be given Rs. 150 rising to Rs. 200. These are three or four examples of the sort of enhancement which we have found it necessary to concede, last year in particular, and the cost of these schemes was very large in the aggregate, although the sum given to individuals was comparatively small.

These were two points which I put before the Council, viz., that our police force is not excessive in number and that it is not exorbitantly paid, and my third point was that, looking to the progressive development of the country in modern times, particularly on the industrial side, it was inevitable that we should have to increase our police force in order to cope with these new conditions. It is again on these three main grounds that I base my case.

I now turn to the detailed explanations, and I will briefly skim through them, although the facts are here in print. I am sorry to take up so much time of the Council, but I am in this difficulty that if I leave any of these points unnoticed, I am apt to be told that we could not explain them. But if the Council will follow me through these items, I think they will find them fairly intelligible.

Under the head of Superintendence the chief increase comes under clerical establishment, in consequence of the increases of pay which we found it necessary to give last year in the form of *ad interim* allowances, which will be consolidated this year when we get the report of Mr. McAlpin's committee.

Under district police, salaries, the budget figures are those for the sanctioned strength, but when we come to the head "police force," we

get the large item of Rs. 18,74,000; this is accounted for under the head pay of sub-inspectors, constables, head constables and European sergeants, by reason of the enhancements to which I have just been referring. That is the largest individual item in this list, and I would again point out that it is in respect of the pay of the subordinate police—the lower-paid police who, it is often urged, with some reason, do not at present receive adequate remuneration.

Under the head, police training school, there is an increase of Rs. 30,000 mainly under the head "travelling allowances." During the war recruitment was bad, and the number at the school was far smaller than now, when the school has been brought up to its normal strength. This increased number accounts also for the growth under the head contingencies.

Coming to the head establishment for district police, we find an item of Rs. 2,26,000, again accounted for by the *ad interim* allowances to clerks.

The head allowances accounts for a large increase of Rs. 3,28,000, and that involves certain new concessions given last year. Previously circle inspectors received a daily allowance of Re. 1 when travelling. I think it will be admitted that this amount was obviously inadequate under modern conditions, and we have last year granted to them travelling allowances under the Civil Service Regulations. Similarly we conceded to inspectors, as part of the improvement of their prospects, either free quarters or house allowances in lieu thereof, neither of which they had previously enjoyed, although that was a privilege of the subordinate ranks. We finally raised the rates of conveyance allowance having regard to the higher prices of grain at the present time. Previously, a sub-inspector who kept a pony received Rs. 20 in the cheaper districts and Rs. 25 in the more expensive ones, but in the light of the reports from all districts that this was inadequate, we raised it to Rs. 30; we also raised the bicycle allowance from Rs. 7-8 to Rs. 10.

Contingencies account for a large increase of Rs. 1,69,000, most of which comes under the head of clothing, and is directly due, partly to the higher prices of the present day, and partly to a concession which we gave last year to constables of a free issue of a pair of *dhoties*, a concession which was greatly appreciated in the light of the high prices of cotton piece goods, and which had a good deal to do with keeping the men contented at a time when they showed some signs of unrest. We further gave the men a concession of a free railway pass to their homes when they went on long leave, a concession which was much valued. A fair proportion of our staff is drawn from up-country, and therefore their travelling expenses when they go to their homes are fairly heavy.

The next three items are petty, after which we come to Rs. 1,04,000 on account of the Eastern Frontier Rifles. That is the force

stationed at Dacca, and it is a well-disciplined body equal, approximately, to a regiment. It is composed of Jharuas, whom we recruit, along with Assam, from the same sources in that province. The Assam Government found it necessary to give the enhanced rate which are represented by these figures, and we are obliged to follow suit unless we wished to be entirely deprived of fresh recruits.

Then we find some six items, aggregating a fair amount, on account of the railway police. The history of the railway police is a peculiar one, and I will sketch it very briefly. The basis of distribution of the cost of the railway police between the Railway and Government has always been that Government paid for what was called the crime and order police, that is, the men responsible for the prevention of crime and the preservation of order on railways which elsewhere are the functions of Government, while the railways paid for the watch and ward establishments which they maintained for the proper safe-guarding of their property. In the old days the total cost under both these heads used to be divided between Government and the railway in the proportion of three-tenths and seven-tenths. That arrangement gave rise to unending squabbling. It gave the railways power to interfere with the strength of the law and order police, with the result that they were often striving to cut down what the police authorities thought necessary, while they were constantly representing that they were paying more than their fair share. Consequently in 1907 a committee was appointed, presided over by Sir Charles Stevenson-Moore, to look into the matter. The committee made a series of somewhat complicated adjustments, with the details of which I will not bore the Council, and a lengthy correspondence ensued as to how this problem could best be solved. It was an unending correspondence, but it was finally agreed between the Secretary of State, the Government of India and the railways that Government would bear the whole cost of law and order police, the railways bearing the whole cost of watch and ward, these two things being separated off, and each side paying for the police for which it was responsible. It was recognised that this arrangement would throw an increased expenditure upon Government, the total sum being calculated at Rs. 8,39,000. The Government of India adjusted that sum directly with the railways—indeed they got most of it back as shareholders—and to recompense the provinces for the extra share that would fall on them they gave assignments to each with effect from the year 1919-20. Our assignment amounted to Rs. 76,000. We have already looked into the matter in connection with this budget, and we are of opinion that that arrangement has pressed hardly upon us. A representation on the subject is about to go to the Government of India, but for the present we can only adhere to the bargain as it was made.

The next item is one of reduction, namely, of Rs. 1,78,000, due to the fact that we have steadily, for the last two years, been reducing the cost of the Central Intelligence Department.

The next item is one of Rs. 1,87,000, which is on account of the Home charges in respect of pensions and leave allowances, a charge which has been thrown on us, as on all other provinces, under the new financial arrangement of the Reforms Scheme. Previously, we had not to pay them either in connection with police or any other service, but in future we shall have to pay, and to that extent we lose.

The remaining items represent the new schemes under the head of district police, and in respect of each we have given a short explanatory note. I will reserve my further remarks till the amendments of which notice has been given, but, for the present, the printed notes will indicate to the Council what these new schemes are and why they have been undertaken.

There remains the Presidency police, and the largest item under that head is one of Rs. 9,05,000, mainly due to the increase in the pay of constables, head constables and sergeants, particulars regarding which I have just given, and also to the entry of Rs. 5 lakhs in connection with the transaction over the Alms House, which was explained in detail by Mr. Stephenson in this Council only about a fortnight ago. The other items are all small, and I think the printed notes explain them adequately, until we come to the lump provision for new schemes, with which I propose to deal in the same manner as with the new schemes under district police.

I have now run through the list, and I take it that members have all read and studied it in greater detail than it is possible for me now to repeat. There remain only the amendments. Ordinarily, I should be content to answer them as they are moved, but I have been specially asked to give some indication now of the line which Government propose to take in answer to each. I did not do this at the time of the original budget, and in respect of the amendments that were withdrawn I had later on opportunity of doing so. I will therefore do it now, as shortly as possible, though when the amendments are moved I will be prepared to give further details.

The first amendment relating to the sergeants of the Calcutta police is one which we are not prepared to accept, because the provision represents an enhancement which was given last year, and if this reduction be made now, we should have to reduce the pay of the sergeants at a time when we cannot fill their ranks even on the scale which is at present offered.

The next item relates to the assistant commissioners, inspectors and sub-inspectors of the Calcutta Police. Their pay was not raised last year, when we took up the case of the lower ranks, simply for financial reasons, and we told them then that they would have to wait. There was an understanding that we would endeavour to deal with their case this year. This matter was fully debated in connection with the budget, and I will only refer members to those proceedings.

The next amendment, I am afraid, I cannot answer until I hear the speech of Babu Surendra Nath Mullick, as I do not know to what he refers.

The fourth amendment is in respect of the *ad interim* allowances to clerical establishments, and I am rather at a loss to understand why this has come from a member of this Council who in the past has been so anxious to improve the prospects of the ministerial staff. We gave these *ad interim* allowances as something to go on with, pending the detailed enquiries by Mr. McAlpin's committee, and we must obviously go on with them until we can consolidate the pay, which is not likely to be done for 4 or 5 months. We have not yet seen that report, we have to examine it in the Secretariat, and probably it will have to go to the Secretary of State. So we shall have to continue to give the *ad interim* allowances for some time; when a consolidated pay is fixed the *ad interim* allowances will be absorbed therein. If there is any margin, it will have to be met from the lump provision which separately figures in the budget. But if this amendment were accepted, its practical effect would be that we should have to reduce the pay of our clerks.

The next amendment by the same member has relation to the clothing charges, the increase under which is due, as I have said, partly to the supply of *dhoties* to the district police, and partly to the supply of boots and shoes to the Calcutta police, a matter on which I remember there was a discussion in the old Council in connection with the budget last year, when it was fully explained. The increase is further due to the very high rise in prices, as is indicated by the fact that whereas at pre-war rates the first kit and maintenance allowances were estimated at Rs. 20 and Rs. 5, respectively, at current rates they are estimated at Rs. 40 and Rs. 16, thus reflecting the rise in the cost of living, which is the curse of our lives at the present moment.

The next amendment has reference to the pay of inspectors in the district police, who, equally, were left out when we improved the pay of the lower ranks last year, and, equally, on an understanding that we would deal with their case this year. The rates which we propose are far lower than those which the Inspector-General recommended, and my only apprehension is that we have cut them too low, we could not see our way to reduce them further.

I now come to amendments Nos. 10 to 16, which in a way deal with matters which are governed by the same general considerations. They relate to three new schemes for increasing the police force which we propose to undertake during the present year, though not for the whole year, as, in the interests of economy, we have made provision for part of the year only. These schemes relate to the town area of the 24-Parganas, to three town areas in the Hooghly district, and to Asansol. They are all three in a manner alike, and are the outcome of the great development which has taken place in these areas in recent years. In the 24-Parganas

and Hooghly, we have rural areas transformed into manufacturing centres; in Asansol we have a rather jungly and backward tract transformed into a busy coal-field with manufacturing centres of such enormous size and importance as those of Kulti and Santa. The police force, as it now stands, having been fixed many years ago at a time when the conditions were quite different, has now proved, by the advice of our departmental officers, to be absolutely inadequate; and in the light particularly of our experience of labour unrest, which is so characteristic of modern times, we considered that it was not safe to allow the police of these tracts to continue on the insufficient scale which has hitherto characterised it. The schemes are expensive, and these sums, it is true, do not represent the cost for the whole year; but we fear that however expensive they may be, they are inevitable.

The next amendment relates to the temporary force, and I take it—although I cannot say for certain until I hear the speech of the mover—that he has particularly in mind the Intelligence Branch which is entertained in certain districts. That is a force of which we found the need in recent years, when it proved necessary to keep a watchful eye on various developments, and it comprises an establishment of three Superintendents, with a subordinate staff ranging from inspectors to constables. In a way, that force is necessitated largely by the overgrowth of districts—a subject which we recently discussed in this Council. These three additional Superintendents are posted at Dacca, Mymensingh, and Dinajpur-Rangpur combined, and the necessity of them is partly due to the fact that the district charges are so large that one Superintendent, even though assisted by an Additional Superintendent, can not cope with the intelligence work in addition to the normal duties appertaining to the management of the force. I take it that the mover would like that force reduced. Our intention is to see during the current year whether a reduction can be effected. We have already during the last two years reduced the Central Criminal Investigation Department, and we have already arranged, if circumstances permit of it, to curtail the district intelligence force. But I cannot agree to the amendment, as it stands, because it asks us to reduce so large a sum as a lakh of rupees.

The next item has reference to allowances and presumably raises details of which we are not aware until I hear actually what the mover wants.

The next amendment relates to the Eastern Frontier Rifles, Dacca, of which I have already given details.

[At this stage the Hon'ble Member reached the time limit.]

I would ask the permission of the Council to go on if it is wished that I should fully justify the items in the budget.

The PRESIDENT: In view of the fact that your speech may have the effect of saving the time of the Council, I think I should allow you to go on.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: The next two amendments relate to the Criminal Investigation Department, and ask us to make further curtailments of over a lakh of rupees—a course which we are not prepared to take in the light of the retrenchments which we have already made and of the duties which still devolve upon that section of the police.

These are the detailed amendments. The list closes with some four amendments—the practical effect of three of which is to wash out the supplementary grant. The answer to these three amendments is the general argument which I have just laid before the Council.

This concludes my general remarks, except that I would ask the permission of the Council to reduce the figure which is specified in the agenda paper by the sum of Rs. 33,000. This arises in this way. The Council may remember that at the time of the general budget debate, I told them that in respect of the pay of inspectors and the higher subordinate executive staff in Calcutta, we had made budget provision on the scale which was asked for by the departmental heads, but I promised the Council that we would scrutinize these demands and endeavour to effect a reduction in them. We have since examined these demands in consultation with the standing committee, and although we were not able to make all the reductions that the committee would have liked, we have made a reduction of a sum of Rs. 17,000 in respect of Calcutta, and of Rs. 16,000 in respect of the Bengal police, making a total of a round sum of Rs. 33,000. With your permission, Sir, I would reduce the lump demand by that amount. It is a cut which has been made as an evidence of our wish to effect all economies that are possible, and it is a cut which is by no means approved by the departmental heads, who, I frankly admit, think that it is too much.

So much for my general remarks, but before proceeding to the different amendments, I would venture to put one general consideration before the Council. We have, in the course of the general debate, on various days heard somewhat bitter and caustic criticisms of the police. As far as this Council is concerned, that is a thing to which we are somewhat accustomed, and which we may to some extent discount in the light of our knowledge of the idiosyncrasies of particular speakers. But that is only in so far as this Council is concerned.

The point which I would put to the Council is that these criticisms have a wider aspect, outside the four walls of this Council Chamber, and they do tell most detrimentally on the discipline and the smooth working of the police. I have already had reports of harm being done by remarks which have been made even in the course of the last few days' debates. False rumours get about among the men and unrest is engendered; while even by the mere fact that I may oppose demands for retrenchments, false ideas may be spread abroad that we as Government are not averse from higher rates. I would therefore put it to the Council

that a discussion of this kind merits being conducted with a considerable degree of circumspection and discretion.

Motions by way of reduction.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK moved "that the demand for the pay of the Sergeants of the Calcutta Police be reduced by Rs. 25,000."

In doing this, I believe I must make a preliminary point clear to the House and to my countrymen with regard to the constitutional position involved in the matter, as I have been asked how is it that I am going to discuss motions on demands made by the Reserved Departments.

It has been in a manner said by the highest authority in the land that demands connected with Reserved Subjects stand on quite a different footing from those connected with Transferred Subjects, so far as the power and privilege of this Council to grant or refuse a demand thereof is concerned.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: I rise to a point of order. The subject before the Council is the Police budget and not the constitutional position of this Council.

The PRESIDENT: It seems to me that in considering the present matter it is relevant to discuss what the powers of the Council are. I therefore think that the member is in order.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK: It has been said that so far as the Reserved Subjects' demands are concerned, they have been placed in the budget in order to allow the Council to have the means of obtaining from the Government the informations connected with such demands or for making the opinion of the Council known on questions of policy connected with them.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think that you are entitled to discuss the speech of His Excellency. You are only entitled to discuss what the powers of the Council are.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK: That is what I am precisely going to do. What I submit with reference to this point is that the view I take is clearly different from the view that some of my friends have since taken with regard to this matter; because section 72 *D* of the Government of India Act confers in quite an unmistakable language the power and privilege of voting the budget in connection with both the departments Reserved and Transferred—and in the section itself of the Act there is no deduction even in the slightest degree from that power except with regard to certain other matters clearly specified in section (5) thereof. It is therefore perfectly clear that the power of the

Council in dealing with the budget of both the Departments is just the same. Of course, it is unquestionable that His Excellency the Governor has the right of rejecting the decision of the Council with regard to Reserved Departments, but that does not show that there is necessarily to be a difference in the angle of vision of the Council while looking at the demands of the two different Departments for the purpose of voting on them. The discretionary power vested in His Excellency with regard to Reserved Departments cannot alter the mode of treatment by the Council of the demands of these Departments and it is to me inconceivable how that discretionary power of veto can in any measure affect the statutory rights of this Council.

With these preliminary observations I beg your leave to withdraw the motion that I have made and I do so for a very good reason. The reason is this that last night at about 8 P.M., I received a paper in which I found that the point on which I had assisted in the Committee had been conceded by the Government and on that point alone I gave notice of this motion. According to the information that has been supplied to us, we find that the present pay of the sergeants is Rs. 150 rising to Rs. 200.

Babu TARIT BHUSAN ROY: I rise to a point of order. Is the member entitled to refer to these matters after withdrawing his motion?

The PRESIDENT: I do not think that the member was entitled to make a speech when he wanted only to withdraw his motion. He made his speech as if he was moving his amendment. All that he is entitled to do, under the rules, is to confine his remarks to his reasons for withdrawal, and nothing more. I will now put it to the House whether he should be given leave to withdraw his motion.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK: Sir, I was just giving my reasons for withdrawing the motions.

The PRESIDENT: You have given your reasons and I will now put the question. I should make it clear that it is not fair that a member should endeavour to get round the rules by speaking to his motion without first informing the Council that it was his intention to withdraw his motion.

The motion was then, by the leave of the Council, withdrawn.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI moved "that a sum of Rs. 1,25,000 towards the revision of pay of the higher subordinate staff of the Calcutta Police be refused."

In moving this amendment I think I may be permitted to say a few words with reference to our powers of interference with regard to the Reserved Subjects on which my friend, Babu Surendra Nath Mullick has said something. As he has withdrawn his motion I do not think that any good opportunity has been given for discussion; so I think I

may be permitted to say a few words with reference to the powers of this Council.

The PRESIDENT: I would point out to the member that he is at liberty to put forward any new argument, but he cannot repeat the arguments which have been advanced by the previous speakers.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: I will say something in addition to what Babu Surendra Nath Mullick has said. (Laughter). We have been told by His Excellency the other day that we have treated both the Transferred and the Reserved Subjects in the same way without any distinction whatever, whereas in His Excellency's opinion in regard to Reserved Subjects, we have the power only to obtain information from Government, but it is conceded that in extreme cases we can interfere under the provisions of section 72 *D* of the Act and His Excellency the Governor can also under special circumstances, if he thinks fit, restore the grant. To my mind, Sir, it is clear that the budget should be considered as a whole and any subject, whether Reserved or Transferred, we can refuse or assent to.

Section (2) of section 72 D says:—

The estimated annual expenditure and revenue of the province shall be laid in the form of a statement before the Council in each year and the proposals of the local government for the appropriation of provincial revenues and other moneys in any year shall be submitted to the vote of the Council in the form of demands for grants. The Council may assent, or refuse its assent, to a demand, or may reduce the amount therein referred to either by a reduction of the whole grant or by the omission or reduction of any of the items of expenditure of which the grant is composed

Provided that—

(a) the local government shall have power, in relation to any such demand, to act as if it had been assented to, notwithstanding the withholding of such assent or the reduction of the amount therein referred to, if the demand relates to a reserved subject, and the Governor certifies that the expenditure provided for by the demand is essential to the discharge of his responsibility for the subject

That is the provision. So, from the people's point of view, I think it is our duty to say if we so feel that a particular sum is not necessary and we can do it simply by withholding our assent. If His Excellency thinks that the sum is necessary for the discharge of his duties and in the interest of Government, he can restore it. That is the clear position. There is no gainsaying that when as people's representatives we think that a particular sum should not be spent, we must say so, otherwise we would fail in our duty.

The PRESIDENT: I think you have discussed that subject long enough. It is time, I think, that you addressed your remarks to the particular motion which you have brought forward.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: All that I want to say is that, though it is a Reserved subject, we have the power of interference and we should interfere if we think it our duty to do so. And I say that here is a case which is of that kind.

The PRESIDENT: I have asked the member before to speak to his amendment and I hope he will do so. The general question should not be discussed any longer.

Mr. TARIT BHUSAN ROY: Sir, may I have your leave to put a question to the member?

The PRESIDENT: No. Let him finish his speech.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: Here is a sum which we are told is necessary for the revision of the pay of the higher subordinate staff of the Calcutta Police. But it is a matter on which no order has yet been passed. It is only proposed to be done. We are told that last year some assurance was given that it would be done this year. Still it presupposes that we must have money. If we have no money, we cannot do it this year. It is not reasonable that we should do it by borrowing. As popular representatives, we must say that we should wait for a year or so. I am not going to say that increments will not be given. But there is no harm in waiting, as we have done in the case of the Subordinate Educational service. There was a Committee appointed and they recommended an increase of Rs. 15 or 16 lakhs. That sum could not be provided and an *ad interim* allowance has been provided in the present year's budget amounting to Rs. 3½ lakhs. If that can be done in the case of officers of one department it can be done in the case of officers of another department.

MINISTER in charge of DEPARTMENT of EDUCATION (the Hon'ble Mr. P. C. Mitter): May I rise to a point of explanation? The question of the subordinate educational staff was not before us when the Budget was prepared and the member is not accurate in his statement.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: I was only showing that we did it in another case and I was saying that if that could be done in one case, it could be done in another. It cannot be said that every department has been properly dealth with. There are other departments which are equally deserving. So I say that we might wait for another year or so, and, therefore, I move for the reduction of this grant. If necessary and if the Government are of opinion that an *ad interim* allowance should be given, then it can be done for a year from the balance of Rs. 25,000 as has been done in the case of the clerical establishment even of the Police Department. In this case there is no urgency, and there is no case for His Excellency's granting a certificate for restoring the grant. In that view I think that the amount may be

reduced leaving only a balance of Rs. 25,000 for the purpose of *ad interim* allowance. The whole thing may be hereafter considered in its fuller details and, if necessary, the grant may be made next year.

In this connection I may mention one other thing. I have come to know that the addition proposed has not satisfied the members of the department. A Standing Committee has recently been appointed and the matter may be gone into in detail by them. I have already shown that this is not a thing for an extraordinary use of His Excellency's power and that it is not a thing which would create the least difficulty for the department.

Babu SURENDRA NATH RAY: I am sorry I have to oppose this motion. When there has been an increase of pay all round—for the members of the Indian Civil Service, for the members of the Provincial Judicial Service, for the members of the Executive Service—when we have budgeted for a sum of Rs. 15 lakhs for the increase of pay of the ministerial officers of Government, I do not really understand why the police department should be left out, why they should be left in the lurch and no increase be given to them. And who are the members of the police service whom my friend wishes to taboo? These are sub-inspectors and inspectors of police, our own countrymen. We are going to refuse an increase of pay to these hard worked officers. We always say that our police is a corrupt police. Why make them corrupt by paying them a small salary? If you want your servants to be contented and above corruption, you must recruit the best men and give them good pay and not starve them. With reference to this grant I must say that this matter has been before the Council twice and I distinctly said on both the occasions that if this additional amount was recommended by the standing committee, it would be passed in the Council and I think that was the opinion of the majority of the members. I have asked most of the members who formed the standing committee and they have assured me that they were all in favour of this increase in the police expenditure. If that be so, I really do not understand why my friend should again move this amendment.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: Did the member say he had consulted all the members of the standing committee?

Babu SURENDRA NATH RAY: I said most of the members, not all.

Sir, in this connection, I think the non-official members of this Council have got a grievance and as this is the only opportunity in which it can be expressed I think it proper that we should give expression to it now. I think it was understood, at least so we thought, that the proceedings of the standing committees should be laid before the Council, so that the members might know what the recommendations of the standing committees were and not have to run after this member

and that for information. I had been to Sir Henry Wheeler yesterday and he told me that the proceedings of the standing committees were of a confidential character. That may be so but we also know that in this very House we said that we should abide by the recommendations of the standing committee. What the recommendations are the members do not know and it is only an inquisitive man like myself who had been to some of the members asking for their opinion that I came to know what their opinion was.

Mr. TARIT BHUSAN ROY: Sir, is my friend in order in referring to an opinion which he does not know?

The PRESIDENT: He is not referring to an opinion he does not know. He refers to the result of the inquiry that he made.

Babu SURENDRA NATH RAY: Sir, I must also say that our constitutional right to vote on such a subject as this has been questioned in high quarters.

The PRESIDENT: I have already said that the same arguments should not be repeated. Has the member anything new to say?

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: May I rise to a point of order, Sir? The right of this Council to vote on a question of this kind has never been questioned in any quarter.

Babu SURENDRA NATH RAY: Very well, Sir, I need not dilate upon this point. I think this is all I have to say.

Mr. D. C. GHOSE: The grant of the police vote has been twice before the House. It has been discussed at considerable length in this Council and has been debated also outside the Council. I have followed very closely the trend of the discussion on this subject and if I have understood aright the thought underlying it. I have understood it to mean primarily as a protest against the continual increase of expenditure in the department concerned with the maintenance of law and order and the almost lack of expenditure, at any rate, of sufficient expenditure, in the departments that promote the welfare and development of the people, namely, the departments which are now in the charge of the Hon'ble the Ministers. And the discussion has also revealed to me another current of thought underlying it. And that is a vehement desire to effect retrenchment in every direction and the desire is so strong that it has become almost an obsession. Sir, I confess I am in sympathy with these two currents of thought underlying the desire to make a reduction of the police vote. I am free to admit, Sir, that in these days of labour and political unrest, increased expenditure in the police department is necessary, but at the same time I cannot admit the proposition that the State should do nothing else but protect its subjects from robbery, murder and aggression.

[Here the member broke down on account of sudden indisposition and resumed his seat.]

Rai JOCENDRA CHUNDER CHOSE Bahadur: I oppose the original motion and also the amendment. The motion before us, apart from the question of our constitutional power, raises a contitutional question of very great moment. We rejected the motion for this grant of Rs. 23 lakhs on a pervious occasion It was attempted to be re-opened. I then objected to it under rule 39. It could not then be re-opened. Then Council was prorogued and technically this may now be re-opened but there is a further more substantial constitutional question. The motion before us is described as one for a supplementary grant.

The PRESIDENT: The motion which is under discussion is the amendment of Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri.

Rai JOCENDRA CHUNDER CHOSE Bahadur: Unless I explain the ground upon which I oppose the amendment I cannot say anything on this matter. I oppose the amendment because I oppose the motion as a constitutional matter and I say that no amendment should also be carried. Therefore I give my reasons why I oppose the motion as well as the amendment. Sir Erskine May, in his Parliamentary Practice, page 452, says: "A supplementary estimate may be presented either for a further grant to a service already sanctioned by Parliament in addition to the sum already demanded for the current financial year or for a grant caused by a fresh occasion for expenditure that has arisen since the presentation of the sessional estimate such as expenditure newly imposed upon the executive Government by statute or to meet the cost created by an unexpected emergency such as an immediate addition to all existing service or the purchase of land or of a work of art." A supplementary estimate must be one in excess of the amount demanded before, necessitated by an emergency which has subsequently arisen and cannot be an amount disallowed before. Thus legally the amount cannot be considered as supplementary and when it is placed before us on that ground constitutionally it is not maintainable and must be rejected.

The PRESIDENT: We are governed by our own rules.

Rai JOCENDRA CHUNDER CHOSE Bahadur: Our rules must follow the rules of the mother of Parliaments.

But there is a far more serious constitutional question involved as regards reserved subjects——

[A Member: He has given no notice to oppose the first motion. Is he in order to oppose it now?]

The PRESIDENT: His argument is that the whole demand for the supplementary grant is out of order. Therefore the amendment goes with that.

Rai JOGENDRA CHUNDER GHOSE Bahadur: Sir, the Council has no control over the Reserved subjects. Indeed if the interpretation of the law as put by His Excellency the Governor while proroguing the Council is right, the Council has practically nothing to do with them.

The PRESIDENT: I have already said that that question has been discussed at great length.

Rai JOGENDRA CHUNDER GHOSE Bahadur: I am not discussing that point at all.

The PRESIDENT: You may go on then.

Rai JOGENDRA CHUNDER GHOSE Bahadur: That being so, it cannot examine, except in a very perfunctory fashion, what amounts are necessary and what are not. The popular representatives would probably like to strike out many items altogether without much ceremony, for example, the large amount demanded for the Criminal Investigation Department which many supporters of law and order would, on no account disallow. Thus the best judges of what is required and what is not for a Reserved department is the Government. The Council as constituted now, in my humble opinion, will not be justified in disallowing any annual expenditure sanctioned in years previous to its existence in respect of a reserved department. But when the Government comes before it for an additional amount on the ground of increase of expenditure the Council may very properly say, we have no control of the department, we can not regulate its expenditure; and we have thus only two alternative left to us, *i.e.*, either to sanction the entire amount demanded or to disallow the whole. It may very properly throw the entire responsibility on the Government for allowing an increase of expenditure by recourse to certifying. We must remember that it is a heavy responsibility which lies upon the Governor when he certifies. Section 72 D of the Councils' Act says that he can certify when the expenditure provided for by the demand is essential to the discharge of his responsibility for the subject.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: May I rise to a point of order. I would ask for your ruling, Sir, whether we are discussing the provisions of the Government of India Act relating to Budget expenditure or the amendment relating to the Calcutta Police.

The PRESIDENT: We are discussing the amendment relating to the Calcutta Police and not the general question. The member should not discuss the general question. It has been discussed long enough already.

Rai JOGENDRA CHUNDER GHOSE Bahadur: The Governor wishes to cast the responsibility upon us. We are not prepared to take the responsibility. That is the question which I am entitled to submit before you. Why should we take it while we have no legal right of control over the department even in an indirect form. We do not know what is necessary or what is not. The Government may know in cases of emergent trouble internal or external that additional expenditure is required and it is in view of such and other circumstances that certain subjects have been reserved: It would not be proper for the Council to take upon itself the responsibility of judging what is necessary and what is not. When those subjects will be placed under popular control and a Minister elected by the Council is in charge, it will certainly take the responsibility upon it. But I do not see why it should do so now.

This is my position. His Excellency has taken up his position on constitutional grounds and we should take him at his word and place our case on a constitutional basis.

It may be said that many of us gave the Government to understand that if a supplementary estimate were placed before the Council, it could be passed. When the question was raised, I objected to the re-opening under rule 39. I further said that if the Committee appointed by us and the Government satisfied us that any portion of the demand was indispensably required, the Council would sanction it. The word I used was indispensable. None of the amounts demanded have been shown to be indispensable. The Committee we appointed has practically gone against the Government. But I must say a large portion of the demand is necessary for the improvement of the department and should therefore be allowed. But why should we be called upon to decide what is thus necessary.

Just consider, if the department were under our control we should like to know what work the Deputy Inspectors-General do, *e.g.*, whether deputy superintendents and inspectors do not do the same work; what work the assistant commissioners of the Calcutta Police do which the deputy commissioners cannot do. While we have no control over these matters and cannot reduce the expenditure in respect of those, I for one would not reduce the expenditure by cutting down the grant for a pair of *dhotis* for each constable nor would I reduce the railway fare of sub-inspectors from second class to intermediate class.

It is supposed that anybody who would not agree to the course recommended by His Excellency the Governor would be guilty of an improper act, would be helping the enemies of peace and order. I would ask the Government and the Europeans here to judge the matter impartially. I should like to ask the English members what would the Canadian or Australian members of Parliament do when a question involving such a grave constitutional issue like the present arose.

The PRESIDENT: I think I must call you to order again. The motion is for the reduction of a particular sum and your discussion must be confined to that. You cannot discuss all the amendments in one speech. You must confine yourself to the amendment under discussion.

Rai JOCENDRA CHUNDER CHOSE Bahadur: In that case I shall have to speak on the last amendment again. I wanted to finish all that I wish to say now.

The PRESIDENT: You may speak on each amendment, but you cannot deal with all the amendments in one speech.

Rai JOCENDRA CHUNDER CHOSE Bahadur: What I said at the very beginning—

The PRESIDENT: You ought to confine yourself to the motion under discussion now. You should not go beyond that.

Rai JOCENDRA CHUNDER CHOSE Bahadur: If you had told me that beforehand I would not have spoken at all. I would have stopped.

A Member: I ask that the question be now put.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: Sir, we seem to be in some danger of talking about every thing except the police budget, and I find it very difficult, on the merits of this particular amendment, to reply to the speeches that have been made in connection with it. I do not intend to follow members in discussions relating to the recent pronouncement made in this Council by His Excellency. The merits of that pronouncement seem to me to be irrelevant in the present connection, and many of the statements that have been made to-day about it have been absolutely inaccurate on the question of fact as to what His Excellency did or did not say. But I must take some notice of another general point that has been raised by Babu Surendra Nath Ray, inasmuch as he has brought my name before the Council in connection with it. The grievance of the member is that we have not published the opinions of the standing committee. I explained to him verbally this morning that he entirely misapprehends the position of the standing committee. That body is the outcome of various discussions in connection with the Reforms which advocated some means by which the members of the Council might be brought into closer touch with the working of the different departments, in a consultative and advisory capacity, in order that they might get to know more about the actual facts which are so often misrepresented. But these committees were to be advisory and consultative, and their proceedings were to be confidential in the sense that, in the first place, no formal proceedings were recorded, and in the second that no formal proceedings would be laid before the Council. That being so, I explained to the member that it was impossible for us to comply with his request, while mentioning further that

the members of that committee were in this Council, and if they desired to express any opinion on any particular point, they were at full liberty to do so. I cannot but think that in this matter he has been more anxious to create a grievance than to represent a reasonable cause of offence.

Apart from that, I am glad to have a bit of sunshine in the course of a somewhat depressing debate, in that I have made a convert of Babu Surendra Nath Ray, who, I am glad to see, in the light, doubtless, of explanations and arguments that have been given, is now prepared to oppose an amendment similar to one which he himself moved in connection with the general budget debate. That, Sir, is a conversion which I greet with pleasure. In the light of it, if I have converted so stubborn a critic, it might be thought unnecessary for me to give further arguments to pacify the members of the Council who are more willing to be persuaded. But the matter has been raised, and although nobody has advanced much argument on the merits of the particular amendment, I feel myself obliged to refer to them.

The main arguments advanced in favour of the amendment by Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri are, first, the general point that we have no money, and, secondly, that we should wait. I previously mentioned in this Council that if we were to follow the argument of having no money to its logical conclusion it would mean that we should never incur any additional expenditure on the police whatever, and I prefer to argue the case as to whether or not the expenditure in itself is justified. As to the alternative of waiting and carrying on partially by giving *ad interim* allowances, I would point out that there is no more pernicious system than that of *ad interim* allowances, if, as frequently happens, the increment so given is soon taken as the minimum from which a fresh enhancement should start. Otherwise this amendment was discussed in detail in connection with the budget debate, when the motion was withdrawn after a discussion. There is therefore nothing new I can say about it, except again to give the Council the facts.

The rank of assistant commissioners, which is first involved, is more or less the successor of the old superintendents, and the old superintendents used to get a pay of Rs. 300 to Rs. 600. On their abolition and the appointment of Deputy Commissioners there was for some time nothing between them and inspectors, but it was found that the Deputy Commissioners could not adequately deal with their charges, and the rank of assistant commissioner was created on the lines of deputy superintendents in the district police. These officers are now paid Rs. 400 rising to Rs. 500, while deputy superintendents get Rs. 200 rising to Rs. 600, with a selection grade of Rs. 700, the lower initial pay being due to the fact that assistant commissioners reach that rank later in life, while deputy superintendents may be appointed to it straight off. The Commissioner of Police wanted us to raise the pay of these officers to Rs. 500—800, which is the pay actually given in Bombay. We declined

to accede to that request, and propose a pay of Rs. 425 to Rs. 625, which I submit, is in no sense unreasonable. It is only Rs. 25 higher in the maximum than the old rate which was given many years ago to Superintendents.

The next rank is that of inspectors who are at present on a pay which dates back to 1904. They are at present paid Rs. 200, Rs. 250 and Rs. 300. The Commissioner asked for a pay of Rs. 300 rising to Rs. 400, as given in Bombay, plus free kit. We propose to give them only Rs. 225 rising to Rs. 350, plus free kit, which is substantially less than what was wanted and substantially less than what is given in Bombay. In addition to the enhancement of pay, some further expenditure is involved by additions to the number, since it has been found the sub-inspectors in charge of sections at the present time are not in all cases up to the responsibility of the more difficult jurisdictions, and should be replaced by officers of a higher grade, namely, inspectors. Originally, the Commissioner asked for an addition of 31, but here again, in order to enforce economy, he reduced his request later to 14.

The last grade is that of sub-inspectors, who now draw Rs. 125, Rs. 140, Rs. 150 and Rs. 175, a pay sanctioned 15 years ago in 1905. Surely their pay must be insufficient now. We propose to give them what the Commissioner asked, namely, Rs. 150 rising to Rs. 200, with free kit. These are the three grades involved in this amendment, and I maintain that in respect of each of them our proposals are justified, though in the total demand of Rs. 1,50,000 I have already announced that, in the interests of economy, we are prepared to make a reduction of Rs. 17,000.

The motion was then put and lost.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK being absent the motion standing in his name (item 6 in the list of business) was deemed to have been withdrawn. It was as follows:—"That the demand for Presidency Police be reduced by Rs. 50,000."

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: I think it will be more convenient if the last two items be taken up first.

The PRESIDENT: That cannot be done. Under our rules, motions for specific reductions must be taken up first before any motion for general reduction can be brought forward.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: Something has been said in discussing the last amendment proposed by me whether the small item should be cut down here and there or whether we should go into the whole demand again. As a member of the standing committee I think I should make my position clear. I do not see that the whole demand is very urgently necessary. On the other hand I think that the matter has been brought very hurriedly before this Council. It has been said

that we expressed a wish that we were prepared to reconsider the matter and at our request this proposal has been brought forward. I give an emphatic denial to that. We repeatedly said——

The PRESIDENT: I believe you are moving the amendment.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: I am certainly moving it but I wish to advance some general arguments in support of it first. The motion was as follows:—That the demand for *ad interim* allowances to the clerks under 'Superintendence' and 'Establishment' be reduced by 1,00,000." Personally speaking I think that the proposal is somewhat premature and we are not responsible for it. It had been specifically said at the time that if we are convinced that any sum is urgently necessary we are sure to agree to the money being provided in the Budget. We however did not complain. We did not say—let us consider the matter and an opportunity be given at once. If my friend Mr. Das or Mr. Rhodes or anybody did it the whole Council, I believe, is not responsible for that. Though I think there is room for retrenchment in several places I propose only certain items. The reason is this. This year there is some difficulty. A committee is going to be proposed to consider the whole question of retrenchment. Only the most important changes that have been introduced may be considered now, but for the rest the question may be discussed when the whole matter will be considered and then it will be necessary to see what general retrenchment is possible in this department. There is no doubt that the police expenditure is gradually increasing and that in this Council and in the past Council also the matter was again and again discussed that the police expenditure should be cut down. In this case my proposal is that the demand for *ad interim* allowance to the clerks be reduced by Rs. 1,00,000. The thing is this. Under "General Administration" we have provided Rs. 45,00,000 for the increment of pay of the clerical staff of all the departments. I believe Mr. McAlpin's committee embraces the case of this department as well and I believe that the increment would be granted from the beginning of the year. If this is done another sum by the way of *ad interim* allowance should not be given. Of course it may be a small sum and I should not grudge this small concession to my countrymen who are low paid. I have full sympathy with them but our position is one of peculiar difficulty—we have got no money, and I think that unnecessary expenditure should not be incurred. Some amount may be necessary to be given for three, four or five months. I do not know how long it will take. If, in the meantime, the whole question is considered and if the provision is made for giving increment from the beginning of the year this *ad interim* allowance may be deducted. We cannot allow provision being made in one place as *ad interim* allowance and another as increment of pay from the beginning of the year. In fact it is with this view that this proposal has been brought

forward. If I am told that when the increment will be given this provision of *ad interim* allowance will be deducted whether the amount remains or not it becomes immaterial—at any rate I like to be assured that there would be no double expenditure. This is the reason for which I have brought forward this amendment. It would be a saving in any case. This is all I have to say in support of my amendment.

Rai MAHENDRA CHANDRA MITRA Bahadur: This motion is a surprise to me. Government have been pleased to make a provision for *ad interim* allowance at certain rates. The budget estimate provides for such allowance. Does my friend mean that this allowance should be discontinued because an enquiry is being made by a committee? It will be a great hardship if this allowance is disallowed. I think it is desirable for my learned friend to withdraw such a motion and not to press the matter further. He does not know, as he has told us, what the report of the committee would be. He finds that a certain amount is provided in the budget estimate Rs. 46 or 45 lakhs for the ministerial officers. Everything is unknown to him and still he would press upon the attention of the Council that this provision is unnecessary and the amount be disallowed. I do not intend to say much in the matter but I do protest against the motion of my learned friend in asking the Council to ignore the difficulties of the ministerial officers in Bengal.

Mr. KRISHNA CHANDRA RAY CHAUDHURI: I oppose this motion and strongly deprecate any effort on the part of a zamindar or a vakil to reduce the allowance to poor clerks already sanctioned by Government. The miserable lot of these poorly paid clerks is a matter which has engaged the attention of most of us and the opinion is unanimous that the community which suffered most from high prices is the clerical community. A clerk in these days is like a "*Dhobika kutta, na gharka na ghatka*" (a washerman's dog, no good as a house dog, and useless to watch his master's clothes left in the wash tank). This is the outcome of the non-vocational education he received in school. He cannot strike neither can he get work if he is dismissed. I appeal to the members not to do anything which is likely to snatch the bread away from the mouth of poor and ill-paid clerks.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: So far as I can understand, the argument of Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri is based on an entire misconception of the facts, and I will only put him one question. Does he or does he not wish to reduce the pay of the clerical establishments? If he wishes to reduce the pay of the clerical establishments, let him press his amendment. If he does not wish to diminish their pay—and I can scarcely believe he does, since for several years past he has been one of the most active advocates of an increase—I would advise him to withdraw it. He seems to be under the impression that there is a double entry: that we have placed these allowances twice over in the budget,

once in the form of *ad interim* allowances and again in the form of a lump provision. I can assure him that we have not done so. We maintain the *ad interim* allowances to the extent that they will be required until consolidated pay is sanctioned, and when that is sanctioned they will go towards meeting the cost of the new rates. Over and above the *ad interim* allowances, at a rough guess—nothing more than a guess, as we have not yet got the report of the committee—we thought the deliberations of Mr. McAlpin and those associated with him might entail an additional expenditure of Rs. 45 lakhs, and we put that in as a lump sum. If the *ad interim* allowances meet the additional pay, well and good, and there will be a saving in this lump provision. But if they do not meet the additional pay then, to the extent of the deficiency, it will have to be met out of the Rs. 45 lakhs, and if it does not altogether absorb the Rs. 45 lakhs then there will again be a saving there. We cannot say which will happen, being in ignorance of what the final recommendation will be. But the statement that there is a double entry is incorrect, and should the total expenditure not amount to the sum provided in the budget, it will merely mean that there will be a corresponding saving.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: In view of what has fallen from the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler that there will be no double expenditure either in respect of the increment of pay or *ad interim* allowance to the clerks, I beg to withdraw the motion.

The motion was then, by leave of the Council, withdrawn.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: Again I rise to move—

The PRESIDENT: Not with a view to withdraw, I suppose. My point is that if you want to withdraw you must say at the very beginning.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: Certainly I am not going to withdraw and I do not like to unnecessarily waste the time of the Council. Here this is not a case of double entry. I propose that the demand for "clothing charges" Calcutta and Bengal Police be reduced by Rs. 1,00,000. The reason is this. I see that there is a difference of over Rs. 1,50,000. I cannot understand why there should be so much difference, and I believe that when the pay has been increased there is no reason why any special concession should be made in the clothing. If it is to be made it may be done on the last year's basis and an additional Rs. 50,000, may be sufficient. I have not suggested that the whole sum provided over and above that provided in the last year's budget should be refused but I say that Rs. 50,000 may be allowed over last year's budget. We have granted the constables an increment of pay a sum of Rs. 10,00,000 has been given to them in the way of increment. Why should there be any more special concession in the way of clothing?

As I said before we are not to see what His Excellency or the Member in charge thinks. We are not to be influenced by any threat of restoration. We are here as people's representatives and we must see whether, as people's representatives, we should support the demand or not. If we are of opinion that we should not support it, it is our clear duty to raise our voice against it and in that view I have raised my voice against this. With these remarks I commend this to the acceptance of the House.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: My general criticism of the speech of Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri is, as is not infrequently the case with his speeches, that they entirely ignore the facts. He speaks of things which ought to be but which, as a matter of fact, are not. If he will produce a competent contractor who will supply these articles of equipment at prices something like 100 per cent. below those now prevailing in the market, I shall be happy to accept the amendment, but until he is able to do so and obviously he is not able to do so I am afraid I must oppose it.

As I have already mentioned, the facts are that the cost of equipment has gone up more than 100 per cent. from original Rs. 20 and maintenance Rs. 5, to original Rs. 45 and maintenance Rs. 16, that is, an increase of over 100 per cent. As a matter of fact, in budgeting, the district Police only raised their previous figure by 100 per cent., and to that extent the provision, far from permitting of reduction, if anything is insufficient. So much for the rise in prices.

The new items are those of *dhotis*, given as a concession to the constables of the district police, and boots and shoes, given as a concession last year to the Calcutta police. Both these concessions are exceedingly valued by the men. They are not unreasonable in themselves, and I am afraid Government are not prepared to advocate that they should be withdrawn. That being so, the cut of Rs. 1,00,000 in respect of this provision is not possible.

The amendment was then put and lost.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI moved "that the demand for revision of pay of the higher subordinate executive staff of the Bengal Police be reduced by Rs. 2,25,000."

I have already said with reference to another item of this nature—item No. 5—that the question of the revision of pay should be kept in abeyance for some time and, in this view, I propose that the demand for revision of pay be reduced by Rs. 2,25,000. The provision for this revision of pay is Rs. 2,75,000, but I have purposely asked to reduce it by Rs. 2,25,000 so that a margin might be left to meet any immediate demand. The balance that will be left in the hands of the Government will enable them to grant some increment to the men concerned

by way of *ad interim* allowance as is being done in the case of the clerical establishment of this particular Department. We have been told that some consideration for these men was in contemplation for some time and that last year an assurance was given that the concession should be granted this year, but I am doubtful about our ability to meet the cost. We might have promised but we have no money, why then should we do so? Though some retrenchment has been made in the budget, it is proposed that some demands though refused by the Council should be restored, so it is difficult to say what will be the actual saving. Even if there be saving a special provision ought to be made for sanitation and education. Though it is very desirable that our subordinates should get an increment of pay in consideration of the difficulties of the time still there is no hurry about it; we can of course give them something by way of *ad interim* allowance. I am also of opinion that the scheme should be considered in all its details. It is a permanent addition to the annual expenditure. Even if it be absolutely necessary we ought to try to save something out of the amount provided for this purpose. The expenditure seems to be too high and we should examine the scheme in order to effect any economy if that is possible. I suggest and I suggest as a member of the standing committee that in this case there is no urgency for the grant for the next few months. These are officers who are not very poorly paid; moreover, an increment of Rs. 25 or so is being granted to them—that is not much relief. By the grant of an *ad interim* allowance we can keep back almost the whole amount. In the meantime we may examine the scheme and when we are satisfied that this increment must be granted and when we can effect some economy in other ways it will be granted from the beginnig of the next year. In this view and with these few words I commend my amendment to the acceptance of the Council.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: This amendment has reference to the pay of the inspectors of the Bengal police. I have already said that, under it, I am prepared to accept a reduction of Rs. 16,000, but I am quite unable to accept so large a retrenchment as that of Rs. 2½ lakhs. The reason adduced by Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri in favour of his amendment is shortly "Let us delay," and I am perfectly sure that, if I am to make this proposal to the Council a year hence, two years hence, or three years hence, his argument will equally be the same "Why give it; let us delay." If I can show to the Council that, if anything, this slight increment of pay is overdue, while the improvement itself is of a modest description, I take it I have refuted his argument.

Now what are the facts? These inspectors at present are in four grades, ranging from Rs. 150—250, and that pay was fixed as far back as 1905—15 years ago. But more than that. This maximum of Rs 250 goes back to 1866, and I ask the members of this Council is

there any service relating to which we can argue in this Council that a maximum which was suitable in 1866 is suitable now. Again although the minimum of Rs. 150 was given in 1905, it was strongly urged so far back as 1890. I again put it to the Council that this is a refutation of the constantly made charge of our squandering money on the police. Far from it; our predecessors kept these men for 15 years out of the modest minimum which had been pressed 15 years before. However the pay, as it stands, dates back to 1905. What the Inspector-General wished us to give was Rs. 175—375. We have cut that and we have cut it almost to the bone, and we propose to give only Rs. 175—300; that is an initial improvement of Rs. 25 and a final improvement of Rs. 50. That can be more than justified by what has been done recently in other provinces: Bihar and Orissa, a cheaper province than Bengal, has equally given a scale of Rs. 175—300. The United Province and Punjab, also cheaper than Bengal, have begun on Rs. 180 and gone up to Rs. 300. Is it unreasonable that we, in Bengal, should do what has been found necessary in these three provinces of Upper India, and what has been so long delayed in connection with these men?

The amendment was then put and lost.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK moved "that the demand for Rs. 80,000 for the reorganisation of the Town Police of the 24-Parganas be refused."

In doing this I find that I am not so fortunate as regards this demand as I was with reference to the other two demands to which I had objected before, namely, the questions of the Sergeants' pay and of the higher subordinate officers of the Presidency Police. In these matters Government practically cut the ground below my feet by making concessions and therefore it became unnecessary for me to move them; but in this particular matter I see no such signs and, therefore, I have got to place this before the House. I had the opportunity of discussing the matter personally with the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler but I am sorry that after the fullest possible discussion I could not but object to this grant. This grant, it must be remembered, is not a reduction of any old grant. This is a totally new demand for adding to the strength of the 24-Parganas Police. The present strength of the 24-Parganas Police (I am quoting the figures) is about 12 inspectors, 116 sub-inspectors, 87 assistant sub-inspectors, 98 head constables and 1,548 constables. What this scheme wants is an additional strength of 2 inspectors, 18 sub-inspectors, 8 head constables and 572 constables.

The demand that has been made for this is Rs. 80,000 and that for four months only. This means the recurring cost hereafter will be Rs. 2,60,000 or Rs. 2½ lakhs, plus the initial expenses and plus something that is unknown, namely, the cost of accommodation. The

figure given there is unknown. Therefore the whole thing will come to at least Rs. 3 lakhs or something more every year if you sanction this demand to-day. The question is whether we should give it or not. So far as the Government view is concerned, they want this. Their reasons are; firstly, that in view of the industrial development around Calcutta there has been the presence of a very large floating population in these mills who are foreigners to Bengal, secondly, they are all unknown to the locality, and thirdly, many of them have criminal tendencies and connections and it is therefore that this additional force should be there to tackle their misdeeds. There is another reason given also that the network of railways and riverways in this district afford peculiar facilities and opportunities to these criminals of evading justice and detection. These are broadly the grounds on which the Government wants this demand. There is one other factor I came to know from the Press which is this: that a scheme is pending ever since 1917 and it is said to have been sanctioned by the Secretary of State in January 1919. These are the grounds on which this demand has been made. I oppose this demand and I beg to press my reasons for the same. First of all even assuming that there is a necessity for this additional police no case has been made out as regards its urgency so that we are bound to take this step this very year. From the facts that appear from the Government papers I find that this scheme was discussed or considered as early as 1917, and that it was sanctioned by the Secretary of State in January 1919. Two budget seasons have passed after that—budgets over which the Government had the entire control—but there was no effort made to place this before the Council. My respectful submission is that that shows that there is not that amount of urgency and if there had been that amount of urgency you would not have left it for two years out of consideration. That is my submission to the House. If it was so urgent it would not have been allowed to lie in one corner for two years to be dragged out just after the Reforms Scheme and just after the budget is in our hands to a certain extent though very limited and therefore the question of urgency does not appear.

Then, Sir there are other circumstances also which I have to bring to the notice of the House in connection with this matter. We must remember that the responsibility is too great to be taken up at once—Rs. 3 lakhs in one district—and there are other districts also which it is proposed to be treated similarly. I would ask the members of this House to remember that new additional charges have been thrown upon us, charges which the Government of Bengal had never been called upon to pay hitherto. One of them is the whole of the railway police. This means that the former Government used to pay about Rs. 3 lakhs and now they have been called to contribute another Rs. 4½ lakhs, that is about Rs. 7½ lakhs altogether. We have to find that money. The second of that description is the home charges Rs. 1,87,000. You have to find that money before you take up new responsibilities. I would

ask you to question yourself whether your funds are quite sufficient to meet the responsibilities which are already on you. We cannot afford to forget that from the next year there will be a chronic deficit of Rs. 2½ crores. If therefore you are prepared to add more to the resources of the Government by additional taxation, by all means have this police here, there, and everywhere; I do not object, but the principal question is that if you do not want to impose fresh taxation then the necessity of considering the desirability of introducing further additional charges which could be deferred is absolutely paramount.

Then the second circumstance that I have got to urge is this that in the 24-Parganas no case has been made out why we should have an army of constables and quite an army of head constables too again. In the 24-Parganas Sadar there is the military police. In the northern part of the district there are two cantonments one at Dum Dum and the other at Barrackpore, the place where these mills are very largely centred. Then again throughout Bengal and headquarters of every district you have a certain number of police force which are known as emergency forces which can always be drawn to 24-Parganas at a very short notice. I therefore think that no case has been made out why you should rush this expenditure in the face of the fact that our resources are very limited and if we do not have recourse to fresh taxation we cannot meet our liabilities if we go on increasing them in the way in which we have been asked to do. Then there is another aspect of it that I have got to place before the House. I am sure I shall be abused so far as that aspect is concerned by gentlemen who have connection with mills. The mill people won't forgive me for saying this, I mean to say, won't be very kind to me for saying this, but the fact remains why is this additional police necessary? On the statement of the Government it is necessary because in the 24-Parganas, forty-three mills have brought together 150,000 people unknown to the place with criminal tendencies who are a danger to the locality. That is the Government view of it. I am quoting the words of Government in this matter. That is not my view. If that be so who would not reasonably expect a very large contribution from these mill-owners before we incur this expenditure. What I am now saying is no new principle. It is an accepted principle altogether. There is the ex-Chairman of the Corporation sitting and he will, I am sure, corroborate me that in the Municipal Act there is a provision that when any person throws extraordinary amount of refuse in the streets which we have got to meet by any additional establishment, well he has got to pay an additional fee for that. That is the law there. We take it to the dumping ground under the Corporation law.

Under the Corporation we know the law. The Commissioners are bound to give you service to a reasonable extent, something like ordinary service, but if you are like the owner of a very big *busti*, a dirty *busti* or a profitable *busti* like the pilgrim *busti* or the owner of

a bazar or the owner of a big cow-shed, which means that you have got to provide for a large quantity, an extra quantity of refuse—you require more service to be paid to you than you are entitled under the ordinary circumstances and under the ordinary arrangements of taxation, then you have got to pay something extra. And there are various sections under which these fees are demanded even from men like *basti* owners.

There is another instance like this. Let us take the fire brigade. Now we in the Calcutta Corporation contribute something like Rs. 2,80,000 towards the cost of this fire brigade. Out of this practically half is paid from the general revenue for the protection of the rate-payers in general for general service. The other half is raised from the warehouse owners and storehouse owners and from persons who accumulate dangerously inflammable things and throw exceptional burden on the fire brigade. It is these people who have got to pay. If you owners of mills aggregate here 150,000 people from all corners of India and throw an extraordinary burden on the local police or the district police which necessitates a large establishment specially meant for the purpose, may I not in all fairness ask for a contribution and to wait till that contribution is paid; that is my next submission. Sir, it has been said by gentlemen interested in the mills: "Oh, we don't want this police." That is all very nice. "Who wants it?" they say—"We don't want them to interfere with our mills." In the same way the warehouse owner or the straw storekeeper might very well say "I won't pay extra fees." The answer to that obviously is this: "You may say that, but if your stores of straw catch fire, the result is that other people's properties are liable to be burnt away. Therefore on account of the extra strain on the fire brigade, you have got to pay extra fees." I suppose this is a very reasonable proposition though of course self-interest may to a very large extent prevent even the most independent and intelligent men from seeing eye to eye with me. Then there is another thing. You will find the same in the case of Port Commissioners. We supply Sergeants to them. They are allowed to live in the quarters. We pay the whole house rent but at the end of the year they give back 7/10ths as fees for extra service they get. Therefore, the principle is nothing new. It is an accepted principle. Even in such petty things, may I draw you attention that when a man loses his father and peforms his *sradh* ceremony if there are 2,000 beggars accumulated for distribution of alms and if you write a letter to the police for help, they will charge you at the rate of Rs. 5 per thousand and tell you "we are here for giving you ordinary service, but if you want extra service you must pay for it."

If we have to keep this additional establishment, should not these mill-owners who are millionaires be made to pay a fair share by way of contribution towards its upkeep.

It has been said in reply by a person for whose opinion I have the greatest respect that they pay a super tax; that is no answer; even a poor *goala* who keeps a number of cattle pays income tax. This is for an extra demand you make on our resources for the police, and it is for this you have got to pay. Yo may have to pay income tax or any other tax, that does not concern us. I therefore submit to the House that in view of the fact that our resources are now considerably less than our expenditure, and we cannot have this windfall every year to start with; viz., Rs. 3 crores, nobody will stand by our side when our expenditure will amount to Rs. 11 crores and our income be considerably less. If we have to go on spending on new proposals like this, this is no reason at all for not paying additional taxes; these people for whom it is necessary ought to contribute. If the demand is for Rs. 80,000 for four months this year, next year we shall have to budget for Rs. 3 lakhs for the whole year.

I thank the Government for the great consideration which it has shown in this particular matter, they have said it is a matter worth saying—that in view of the financial stringency they admit financial stringency—they want to introduce this in part only, and this part will cost Rs. 1,65,000. Government are prepared to reduce their demand in view of our financial stringency from Rs. 23,18,000 to Rs. 21,85,600; I am thankful for small mercies, for "sufferance is the badge of our tribe."

The PRESIDENT: This motion and the next which stands in the name of Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri are identical, and, therefore, in accordance with the practice which I have adopted, I give Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri, the first opportunity to speak on the motion.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: I support the amendment moved by the previous speaker. It is not necessary to repeat the weighty arguments already advanced, but I would say this that we have not come here to obstruct the administration of the Police Department, or, for the matter of that, any department at all. I know funds are required urgently in several departments, but at the same time I must say that Bengal is groaning under the increased expenditure on police. It is time that we should see how to effect a decrease instead of increasing this expenditure. This year it is a question of Rs. 80,000, it will be seen however that it is not a question of Rs. 80,000 annually, but it will mean nearly Rs. 3,00,000 or Rs. 2,18,990 recurring, and an initial expenditure for the cost of accommodation, over and above this amount. This means a permanent addition of a heavy sum, and should be carried out cautiously. In the Bengal Police there is over Rs 2 lakhs spent on temporary force when necessity arises. There should not be any extra expense over and above this amount for the temporary force. We should proceed cautiously so that

we may not have to undo next year what we do this year. The proprietors in the jute mills should be responsible for the whole or at least a part of the cost of the police in those areas, as it is maintained for them. I appeal through you, Sir, that the Council, should not be driven to the last resort of again refusing the whole amount, on account of the short-sighted policy, if I may be permitted to say so, of Government insisting upon a demand for strengthening the police force. We have no real power, and even if we refuse the grant, His Excellency the Governor can any moment restore it. But this is rather an undignified position which should not be faced, and I hope the Government will reconsider the situation and not force this expenditure upon us, and force us to a position which would be very unpleasant both for the Council, I mean the representatives of the people, and the Government.

With these words, I support the amendment.

Babu AMULYA DHONE ADDY: I am sorry to oppose this amendment I agree with my friends that some retrenchment should be made in the police budget, but in this particular case, no retrenchment should be made. It appears from the Budget that in the year 1917-18, the police grant amounted to Rs 12,60,000; this year it has been increased to Rs. 19,00 000. I expected that the Police Standing Committee would make some material retrenchment, but I am really disappointed. I expected that we would see the proceedings of the meeting of the Police Committee, but I am sorry to learn from the Secretary to the Council that these proceedings are confidential. However, as appears from the note which has been printed and circulated, I find that there is some reasonable ground for retaining this police guard for the district of the 24-Parganas. The populaton of this district has increased; several jute mills have been erected especially in the northern division of this district, and several mills are likely to be erected in the near future. It has been said that the proprietors of the jute mills are interested in the question, and therefore, they should pay for it, but if I may be allowed to say so, most of the shareholders of these mills are Indians.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK: I beg to rise to a point of order; is it relevant whether the shareholders are Indians or Europeans?

The PRESIDENT: The member is in order. Let him go on.

Babu AMULYA DHONE ADDY: We get a duty of Rs. 2½ crores per annum from the existence of these jute mills and if the Government of India will permit us to retain this duty, we shall have an income of Rs. 2½ crores from jute alone; we have already made a representation to the Government of India to have it restored to us. In these circumstances are not the proprietors of these jute-mills entitled to have some expenditure from this amount for the protection of their property? Moreover, it also appears that in the northern division of this district,

which is the terminus of the proposed Grand Trunk Canal, it is necessary for the protection of Indian trade that the police force should be increased.

It has been said that there is a recurring expenditure to the amount of Rs. 3 lakhs per annum, but it appears from the note which has been circulated that the initial expenditure amounts to Rs. 28,000 only, and that the recurring expenditure amounts to Rs. 2 lakhs per annum. I do not think that this additional sum is an unreasonable or excessive one.

It has been said by my esteemed friend that the scheme was sanctioned a few years ago and is now entered in the budget. That is no reason why it should not be entered in the budget for the current year, because I find it is absolutely necessary for the protection of life and property of the people of the 24-Parganas.

It has been said that there is the cantonment at Barrackpore. I beg to submit that prevention is better than cure. Then, what is this amount for? It is not for additional allowances, nor for increment of salaries but for increasing the number of officers and constables, and it is required for the protection of the life and property of the Indians of the district.

With these few words I oppose the amendment.

Mr. R. H. L. LANGFORD JAMES: As representing the Indian Jute Mills Association, and consequently the jute industry, I would like to make a few remarks on the subject of this resolution. Anybody knowing the jute mill areas, and having known them for any considerable length of time, is very well aware that these areas are under-policed, that is to say, the number of the police has not kept pace with the growth of the population. Therefore, we accept Sir Henry Wheeler's statement that the additional police in the mill areas are necessary. I think that Mr. Mullick is probably also of the same opinion, but with him it is more a question of who is to pay for the police? He maintains that the extra police are required because of the presence of the jute mills and that, therefore, the people who should pay are the mills. I expected, I may say, that the argument in favour of that point of view would be based on the fact that the railways contribute towards the cost of the railway police; that argument has not developed. In place of that Mr. Mullick brings forward the argument of the Calcutta Fire Brigade. Now, I daresay, Mr. Mullick knows as well as I do, that Calcutta is the only town in the world which taxes a special industry for the use of the fire brigade. In every other town in the world, the cost of the fire brigade comes out of the general rates.

It is a fact that we do not actually require additional police for the protection of our mill property. The majority of mills employ a certain

number of durwans, and these durwans are, we find, capable of protecting our property. Not only do these durwans protect our own property, but I may mention that, incidentally, they relieve the local police of a certain amount of work in that they do chaukidari work in the local villages where our workers live. But our point is that the whole of the mill areas are underpoliced, and on that account we agree with the Government in asking for this extra grant. The mills have brought very great prosperity to Bengal, and they have done much for the districts in which they are situated. They not only pay full municipal rates, but they do much to relieve the local municipalities of work which might reasonably be expected to fall to their lot. As I daresay Mr. Mullick knows, there are very large sanitation schemes at present on the tapis, some of them more or less well advanced; the mills have put in local water supplies, have supplied a considerable amount of lighting for roads, they have even in many cases gone to the extent of making new roads themselves, which the local boards and municipalities would naturally have had to make. The Mill Companies pay away, or did pay away last year, in income tax, something like two crores of rupees, and I believe I am right in saying that our wages bills, that is to say, the money paid to the workers in the mills, excluding management staff, amounts to something like five crores of rupees in a year.

Now, Sir, why should we be further penalised to pay for law and order in our district? As a matter of fact, it appears to me that this doctrine of specialised payments in connection with a matter like the maintenance of law and order, is a very danggrous one to propound.

I might reasonably say, I live in Loudon Street, and I consider Loudon Street an uncommonly healthy part of the town; why should I pay as much towards that department which looks after the health of the town as a resident in one of the less healthy parts, Burra Bazar, for instance. Once you start an argument of that sort (I have not tried to develop it but no doubt it could be developed upon very extensive lines) you will never stop. For one thing, only a few years ago if you drove up the Barrackpore Road, I do not think you saw any police station at all; now, if my memory does not fail me, between the corner of the Dum-Dum Road and the Titaghur Bazar, there are four police stations and police outposts. These, I understand, were put in there to protect the town of Calcutta in the event of an obstreporous mob advancing in this direction from Titaghur. Under Mr Mullick's scheme who is to pay for the upkeep of these? Does Calcutta pay for them? Do the local boards in whose districts they are situated pay for them, or who does? I do not wish to develop the line of argument to any greater length.

Personally, I consider that a very broad question, such as the one raised by Mr. Mullick, which one might almost call the municipalisation of the police, is not a question which should have been raised in a resolution of this sort at all. It is a most important question, and

before it was ever introduced in this Council, due notice should have been given and a special resolution introduced.

Babu BHABENDRA CHANDRA RAY: We find in the Budget that this is an important scheme provided for the reorganisation of the town police in the 24-Parganas, which has long been approved, but which could not be introduced earlier for want of funds. If want of funds prevented the introduction of this scheme so long, I think the reasons stand good even to-day. The idea is to give increased protection to the people by the addition of subordinate officers and constables to the already existing force in the district. But, Sir, to my mind, no amount of such additions will serve the stated purpose, unless people have got the wherewithal to protect themselves with, i.e., arms. The towns in the 24-Parganas with few exceptions are getting thinner every day due to malaria and other causes, and Calcutta is increasing by bounds. So there is little need of additional police force in the district town just now when money is badly wanted for other and better purposes.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: The speeches made by some of the members, noticeably Mr. Langford James and Babu Amulya Dhone Addy, have relieved me of a great part of my task in answering these amendments, and I much appreciate the assistance they have given, but in supplementing their remarks there are one or two points which it may be worth while drawing attention.

This scheme, as I have already outlined, is briefly, for the strengthening of the police in the town portion of the 24-Parganas, in consequence of the development of these areas in recent years, which has rendered absolutely inadequate the force which was based upon the circumstances of earlier times, and which has rendered it inadequate to a degree which prompted the committee of 1916 to write, for instance, that patrolling is frequently a mere farce—a remark typical of much of their report. The objections to this expenditure which we have heard, resolve themselves, in essentials, to the old three points upon which we have been ringing the changes now for the last few days. First, that the expenditure is large; this, I admit. The ultimate cost will amount to rather over Rs. 2 lakhs recurring, and Rs. 28,000 non-recurring. Second, that the province is poor and the financial position is bad, regarding which I can only again adduce the general argument that if we can show that the expenditure is in itself justifiable, and even essential, then it is incumbent upon the province to find the money for it, just as it does find money for things which are less urgent. Third, that the matter is of no urgency, why not put it off, with reference to which I would again like to know on what date is this period of urgency to materialise, and the matter to come within the region of practical politics. In this matter we are likely to suffer for our own moderation. Because for financial reasons, we postponed bringing this scheme forward before, because for financial reasons, even now, we are only asking for provision for

part of the year, we are told to put it off again. Surely this is rather an unjust way of turning our own moderation and reluctance to enhance the police budget against us. I think that it can be shown that the scheme is of considerable urgency. In the first place, although actual proposals were not formulated till 1917 the need was mooted by the Inspector-General as long ago as 1914. Can anybody say, that if there was a necessity in 1917, that necessity is not far greater now in April 1921. In fact, much of the details and statistics in this report must by now be out-of-date. Again, on the subject of urgency, whatever were the labour conditions prevailing in 1914 and 1917, I think it will be generally admitted that they were far more favourable and gave less ground for apprehension than the labour conditions as they are now, and as they have manifested themselves within the last 12 months or so.

But we are told by Babu Surendra Nath Mullick: "Why not meet it with your emergency force at headquarters or with the Military?" We are told by Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri: "Why not meet it with the temporary force for which provision is made in the budget?" We cannot adopt these expedients for the reason that this is a recurring need; it is not an exceptional need which has shown itself for a few days only, but it is a need appertaining to the police administration of these areas throughout the year, and to bring in, as a solution, a body like the emergency headquarters force, which is intended primarily to deal with momentary and special crises, would obviously be inappropriate. As regards the Military it is perhaps not known that the Government of India have recently taken grave exception to the tendency which has been shown in some provinces to avoid extra expenditure on police by utilising soldiers for what is properly police work. It is a charge to which we do not plead guilty, neither do I think that we have been guilty of it in the past, but I mention the fact in order to show the attitude of the Government of India towards the utilisation of the Military for police duties. As regards the temporary force, to which Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri has alluded, although temporarily sanctioned it is in the Budget in respect of specific purposes, and without abandoning those specific purposes, it would be perfectly impossible to transfer the force for any other work.

On these grounds, I submit that the amendment is not sustainable, and the only new matter that has been introduced is the suggestion that, even granting the need for additional police, it is proper that the mills should pay. That has been answered by Mr. Langford James, in particular, and I thoroughly agree with him that it is a somewhat dangerous doctrine to put forward. In the first place, while the mills and the cooly population which surrounds them may be a very important factor in the development that has taken place in recent years, it is not the only factor, and there are other changes which have tended in modern times to increase the population of these localities. There is

all the vast work and wealth of Calcutta, and if anybody wants to judge of this he has got only to see any morning, outside Howrah or Sealdah or the ferry steamer piers, how many workers in Calcutta come in from these outlying areas. There are the railways and the steamship companies, to instance only two of the many activities which centre round this large city and its neighbourhood. I ask who is going to equitably assess this doctrine of individual responsibility, even if it is admitted? Then again the industrial development of India is a desirable thing in itself and it is acclaimed in all quarters as such. If so, presumably the men who are participating in that development are to that extent benefiting the country at large. Now, there is a provision in the Police Act by which for misbehaviour sections of the population can be penalised and made to pay for additional police. I have seldom known use to be made of this section without its being forcibly assailed by the gentlemen who are usually our critics. But apparently, although it is an iniquitous thing to specially assess a wrong-doer, it is a righteous thing to specially assess a benefactor. The position appears somewhat illogical. Lastly, there is a point to which Mr. Langford James alluded, namely by what standard is this particular item to be debited to the mills? The mills may plead, as Mr. Langford James has pleaded, that in other directions they make substantial contributions to the State exchequer and do much for the benefit of the places with which they are concerned. It is a somewhat delicate matter to attempt to assess the value of these contributions against the share which the mills may claim, along with any other section of the community, in the protection and in the maintenance of law and order which is extended to every citizen by the State. However, in any case this issue is a side one and does not touch the merits of the scheme upon which I have laid stress.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK: May I have your permission to reply for only two minutes?

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry, under the rules there is no right of reply given to the mover of an amendment.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK: I bow to your ruling.

On the motion being put, Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri asked for a division.

A division was then taken with the following result:—

AYES.

Chaudhuri, Babu Kishori Mohan.
Chaudhuri, Khan Bahadur Maulvi Hafizar Rahman.
Chaudhuri, Rai Harendranath.
Dutta, Babu Indu Bhushan.
Haq, Shah Syed Emdadul.
Huq, Maulvi Ekramul.
Janah, Babu Sarat Chandra.
Khan Maulvi Hamid-ud-din.
Maitra, Dr. Jatindra Nath.
Mitra, Rai Bahadur Mahendra Chandra.
Mukhopadhaya, Babu Sarat Chandra.
Mullick, Babu Surendra Nath.
Nasker, Babu Hem Chandra.
Pahlowan, Maulvi Md. Abdul Jabbar.
Ray, Babu Bhabendra Chandra.
Ray, Kumar Shib Shekhareswar.
Roy, Babu Nalini Nath.

NOES.

Addy, Babu Amulya Dhone
Afzal, Nawabzada K. M. Khan Bahadur.
Ahmed, Maulvi Azaharuddin.
Ahmed, Maulvi Masbah Uddin.
Ali, Mr. Syed Erfan.
Ali, Mr. Syed Nawm.
Ali, Munshi Ayub.
Alam, Khan Bahadur Khwaja Muhammad.
Banerjea, the Hon'ble Sir Surendra Nath.
Barma, Rai Sahib Panchanan.
Birla, Babu Chaneshyam Das.
Birley, Mr. L.
Bompas, Mr. C. N.
Bose, Mr. S. M.
Cathcart, Mr. M.
Chaudhuri, Babu Tankanath.
Chaudhuri, the Hon'ble the Nawab Saiyid Nawab Ali, Khan Bahadur.
Cochran, Mr. A.
Cohen, Mr. D. J.
Das, Babu Bhishmadev.
Das, Mr. S. R.
Das, Rai Bahadur Amar Nath.
Das Gupta, Babu Hibaran Chandra.
Dey, Mr. C. C.
Donald, Mr. J.
Dutta, Mr. Ajoy Chunder.
Farequi, Mr. K. G. M.
Chatak, Rai Sahib Nilmani.
Chosa, Rai Bahadur Jogendra Chunder.
Cordon, Mr. A. D.
Gupta, Mr. N. B.
Hopkyns, Mr. W. S.
Hornell, Mr. W. W.
James, Mr. R. H. L. Langford.
Karim, Maulvi Fazlal.
Kerr, the Hon'ble Mr. J. H.
Khan, Babu Devendra Lal.
Khan, Maulvi Md. Rafique Uddin.
Khan, Mr. Razaur Rahman.
Khan Chaudhuri, Khan Bahadur Maulvi Muhammad Ershad Ali.
Lang, Mr. J.
Larmour, Mr. F. A.
Lees, Mr. D. H.
Marr, Mr. A.
McKenzie, Mr. D. P.
Mitter, the Hon'ble Mr. P. C.
Morgan, Mr. C.
Mukharji, Babu Satish Chandra.
Mukherji, Professor S. C.
Mullick, Babu Nirode Behary.
Nakey, Mirza Muhammad Ali.
O'Malley, Mr. L. S. S.
O'Kinealy Lt.-Col. Frederick.
Pugh, Colonel A. J.
Payne, Mr. C. F.
Rahim, the Hon'ble Sir Abd-ur-,
Ray, Babu Surendra Nath.
Ray Choudhury, Raja Manmatha Nath.
Rhodes, Mr. C. W.
Roy, Babu Jogendra Krishna.
Roy, Babu Jogendra Nath.
Roy, Rai Bahadur Lalit Mohan Singh.
Roy, Raja Manilell Singh.
Sarkar, Babu Jogesh Chandra,
Sarkar, Babu Rishindra Nath.
Sinha, Babu Surendra Narayan.
Suhrawardy, Dr. A.
Suhrawardy, Dr. Hassan.
Suhrawardy, Mr. H. S.
Swan, Mr. J. A. L.
Watson-Smyth, Mr. R. M.
Wheeler, the Hon'ble Sir Henry.
Wordsworth, Mr. W. C.

The Ayes being 17 and the Noes 73, the motion was lost.

At this stage the Council adjourned for 15 minutes.

After the adjournment.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! Babu Surendra Nath Mullick.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK formally moved "that the demand for Rs. 45,000 for the reorganisation of the town police of Hooghly be refused."

I do not like to make a speech as my grounds are just the same as those I put forward on the last occasion: and I do not want to repeat them. I simply formally place it before the Council.

The PRESIDENT: As Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri has got an identical motion, I would ask him to speak on the motion first.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: I would simply support the motion and do not think that any further speech is necessary. I have already said what I had to say on the previous motions.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: I too, Sir, have nothing new to say in connection with these amendments. The general justification

which I put forward relative to the 24-Parganas has equal reference to this scheme. It is not so expensive as that for the 24-Parganas scheme, the recurring cost being only Rs. 78,000 and the non-recurring Rs. 11,000; but its justification is similar.

The motion was then put and lost.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI moved "that the demand for Rs. 20,000 for strengthening the emergency police force at Asansol be refused."

I do not think it is necessary to say much about it as I have already submitted my reasons for these proposals to the Council. Without taking much time of the Council I beg formally to move it for the acceptance of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: The next two motions are identical, so I shall give an opportunity, to those in whose names the motions stand, to speak. I call upon Rai Mahendra Chandra Mitra Bahadur to speak.

Rai MAHENDRA CHANDRA MITRA Bahadur: I wish to say a few words in connection with this motion, so that, I may not be misunderstood. I may be permitted to say that one of the primary functions of Government is to keep peace and I know there are special difficulties in the Burdwan district, subdivision Asansol, where there is a large number of coolies employed in the collieries. But the question which I put to the Council is whether an additional force is necessary at Asansol, or whether the situation can be met by other ways. Now, it appears that in the Burdwan Division there are armed forces in all districts and there is a special Military Gurkha force in Chinsura. It also appears that the services of the Gurkha force are required whenever there are exceptional circumstances. Further, the Chinsura Military force is taken to various areas where the mills are situated, if there be any contingency. At Dacca, I have been informed, there are six to seven hundred armed forces and also military forces. If therefore any portion of that force be transferred to Chinsura and located in places where there are buildings, it would not be necessary for Government to incur large expenses. The Asansol portion of the Burdwan district is interconnected with railways and the distance by railway is of about 3 hours journey; so it will not be difficult to have the military force at Chinsura removed to Asansol for the purpose of dealing with any dispute between the colliery management and the labourers there. It will not be necessary to spend further money. The amount which is budgeted is now Rs. 20,000, that is for a few months. It is highly probable that that amount will be doubled within a year and consequently we will have to incur an expenditure of Rs. 40,000 for maintaining the additional force at Asansol. There will be an expenditure on building account too, that is, additional buildings are to be constructed there for the location of this additional force. We can avoid

this additional expenditure if a portion of the force at Dacca be brought to Chinsura, located there and their services utilised. This is a suggestion which I submit to the Council, and if the suggestion is acceptable to the Government Member, I hope he will find his way to consider whether an additional amount is to be provided in the Budget estimates. We are trying our best to practise economy. It is my earnest desire that when I advocate the view that additional force may be utilised, I mean to suggest that further amount should not be spent. It is needless for me to discuss the question further. If the suggestion is accepted, then I submit the whole thing can be simplified.

Babu BHABENDRA CHANDRA RAY: I am sure I shall be accused for uttering irresponsible words or taking part in an irresponsible discussion when I rise to support this motion. The existing force at Asansol has been doing its duty so long creditably. There was scarcely any real disturbance in that place amongst the labourers till and until recently when they were forced to do so owing to the necessity of keeping their body and soul together. The idea is to increase the existing staff of Police Force threefold. If there is any real disturbance of a general character amongst the labourers in such an area, the proposed addition will be quite inadequate to cope with the situation. Outside help will have to be resorted to and Asansol is within easy reach of other places from where such help can be drawn upon. Then, Sir, where is the necessity of making permanent fixtures like these additions in this year of stress and strain. Further, the labourers may eye the swelling of the Police there with suspicion and distrust. The addition itself may also be a cause of trouble and unrest.

With these words I beg to support this motion.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: Sir, this scheme too is closely analogous to the two schemes about which the Council has just been talking, in so far as it is a scheme to increase the police force at a particular centre in view of modern developments. Asansol, besides being now an important railway junction, is also the centre of a large manufacturing and colliery area. The subdivision is dotted with collieries; in Kulti we have the huge works employing, I am told, some 10,000 coolies, and at Santa another huge work likely to employ some 15,000 coolies. All these men congregate in these areas, while many are very ignorant and liable to be misled. With the various forces which nowadays are at work making for unrest, Government consider it unsafe to leave this important centre without a small emergency force which could be utilised in the event of trouble. We have actually had trouble here in the recent past. It was not very long ago that we had a serious strike and disturbance at Kulti. It was not very long ago that troops had to be sent to Asansol, and I have already reminded the Council about the views of the Government of India regarding the employment

of military for what is more properly police work. At present at Asansol we have a small force only—a sergeant, two head-constables and 24 constables. Our proposals contemplates the addition of an inspector, a sergeant, 6 head-constables and 100 constables, at a recurring cost of Rs. 37,842 and non-recurring cost of a little over Rs. 5,000. The scheme, I submit, is nothing more than a reasonable insurance against possible risk. But I have every wish to meet the Council, as far as I can, in their desire for economy, and I have given examples already in which we have acted with reluctance in the matter of police expenditure. In this present instance I am willing to give another. There will be some difficulty about housing these men, and I am willing to start with an addition of 50 constables only, with a corresponding reduction in subordinate officers. Whether that will answer or not, time alone will show. But it will take us time to get the force started this year, and as an evidence of good faith and our desire for economy I am willing to start on a small scale. The budget provision is for Rs. 20,000. Without calculation, I could not tell exactly what reduction is possible, but I think I may safely knock off Rs. 7,500; and if the mover agrees to put the amendment in that form, I will not object to it. But if it is for the whole Rs. 20,000 Government are bound to take exception.

Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri and **Rai Mahendra Chandra Mitra Bahadur,** having accepted Sir Henry Wheeler's suggestion, the motion was put in the following form and agreed to:—"That the demand for Rs. 20,000 for strengthening the emergency Police force at Asansol be reduced by Rs. 7,500."

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: moved "that the demand for 'temporary Force' be reduced by Rs. 1,00,000."

There is no explanation in the Budget or in the paper now supplied to us as to why this additional amount over last year's provision should be necessary. In the absence of any special explanation I may take it that it is only by way of guess that the sum has been put down rather carelessly, and that whatever may be necessary would be spent. This is not the way in which the Budget should be treated at least this year as it is a year of stringency. It is useless for me to repeat my arguments over and over again. But I think that here is a case in which Government can safely accept our recommendation and reduce the demand by a lakh.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: Sir, this is a provision which is not altogether easy for the ordinary member of the Council to understand, but I can assure Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri that it has not, as he surmises, been arrived at on a basis of guess work. It represents the aggregate of various definite sanctioned schemes. It would appear, at first sight, that the provision of Rs. 3,00,000, which is asked for this year, is an appreciable reduction from last year's budget figure

of Rs.5,71,582. But this is misleading, as last year's budget included provision for allowances, contingencies, etc., which this year have been included elsewhere. Speaking generally, we are merely asking for a continuance of the provision of last year, and that provision is made up of a number of detailed items which, for one reason or another, are not sanctioned permanently but on a temporary footing. This may arise from one of two causes. One is that the work to be done may only be for a portion of the year. There are petty schemes of that nature, such as the provision of guards for Government House at Darjeeling when the Governor is in residence there; special guards at jute centres during the jute season for the protection of the large sums of money then accumulated there. That is one class of temporary sanction. There is another class in which, although the force is working throughout the year, its retention has not been accepted by Government as a permanency. We, therefore, give what we call temporary sanction, to be renewed after a term of one year or more, in order to enable the necessities of the case to be re-examined when the temporary sanction runs out. The most important schemes of that nature, are the following. There is a second additional Superintendent at Mymensingh. This has been found to be necessary owing to the excessive size of the district, but we have been reluctant to admit that it is permanently required. For the time being it has been kept on a temporary footing. This costs Rs. 9,900. Then we have three establishments, costing a little more than Rs. 20,000, for the surveillance of the criminal tribes in the districts of Bakarganj, the 24-Parganas and Midnapore. It is important work to which more attention is paid now than previously, but here again we are reluctant to give a special permanent staff, although eventually we may have to do so.

Then in Bankura we have temporary beat posts, costing a little over Rs. 6,000. Again in the Madaripur subdivision we have an experimental scheme for daffadars under which Government contributes towards their pay in the hope of getting a better type of men. But the most important item is the district intelligence branch which costs Rs. 2,54,796. I have already explained to the Council why that force was created a few years ago, and why it is being employed now. But in consequence of the better atmosphere now prevailing in the province in connection with what was called the seditious movement we have made appreciable reductions in the Central Criminal Investigation Department, and we contemplate this year endeavouring to make some reduction in the matter of the district intelligence branch, if the atmosphere remains calm. I cannot say more than that off-hand. In the place of our old troubles with the Anusilan and Jugantar movements, we have new troubles connected with other movements, and it is difficult to foresee how these may develop. But I can assure the Council that it is our earnest hope that during the year it will be found possible to reduce that

staff and so effect an economy. I cannot accept the amendment as it stands, but I can offer this assurance to the mover.

The PRESIDENT: The next amendment is identical with the one that has been moved and I ought to have called upon Babu Surendra Nath Mullick to speak; but, as I understand, he does not desire to speak I now put the motion to the House.

The motion of Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri was put and lost.

Adjournment.

The Council was then adjourned to the next day the 21st April, at 3 P.M.

Proceedings of the Bengal Legislative Council assembled under the provisions of the Government of India Act.

THE Council met in the Council Chamber in the Town Hall, Calcutta, on Thursday, the 21st April, 1921, at 3 P.M.

Present:

The Hon'ble the President, the Hon'ble the four Members of the Executive Council, the Hon'ble the three Ministers and 108 nominated and elected members.

Motions for Supplementary grants.

26—Police.

The discussion on the voting of the supplementary grant for "26 Police" was resumed.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon'ble Nawab Sir Syed Shams-ul-Huda): Order! Order! Babu Surendra Nath Mullick.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK moved "that the demand for 'Allowances' for the District Executive Force be reduced by Rs. 1,00,000."

This demand last year was Rs. 11,09,000. This year the demand is Rs. 14,37,000 and therefore there is an additional demand of Rs. 3,28,000. It comprises additional travelling expense to police inspectors and Rs. 2,56,000 for general rise in house rent and other allowances. My submission to the House is this: that during the last year, while it was Rs. 11,09,000, this sudden jump to Rs. 14,37,000 appears to be too much, because last year also was a year of high prices. Increased travelling allowances of Rs. 64,000 to Inspectors is based on the last year's figures of Rs. 30,000, and so the increase to Rs. 64,000 cannot be said to be normal. This, I have the honour to submit seems to be rather too much.

There is another thing that is comprised in this—Sub-Inspectors' travelling allowance. One fact about this that I would beg to submit to this House is this. Formerly the pay of the sub-inspectors was Rs. 50—100; it has now been raised to Rs. 80—130, and therefore those sub-inspectors whose pay has been raised generally over Rs. 100 are now entitled to second class travelling allowance. I can appreciate this that because on account of hard times the sub-inspectors' pay has been increased, but I can hardly appreciate that necessarily they should be allowed the luxury of second class travelling allowance because their pay or the pay of most of them has gone over Rs. 100 and therefore under the Civil Service Regulations they are entitled to second class travelling allowance. Then comes the house-rent. We have not got the exact

figures about that. But there is another thing which alone, to my mind, if it is properly reduced, will bring in about Rs. 80,000 to Rs. 90,000, that is the pony allowance given to sub-inspectors and inspectors. This allowance used to be Rs. 20 before, and the department now wants to raise it to Rs. 30. Now leaving Alipore and Howrah, which are practically parts of the town of Calcutta, for all other mufassal stations, if we raise it to Rs. 25 and not Rs. 30, that is to say, if we reduce the demand by Rs. 5, there will be a saving of Rs. 60 per inspector or sub-inspector. I believe the number is 1,537 sub-inspectors and 78 inspectors, and if we make this reduction, we get something like Rs. 90,000. Therefore, this Rs. 90,000 *plus* a certain amount, say Rs. 25,000, that we might get from the travelling allowance of sub-inspectors, perfectly justifies a reduction of much more than a lakh. And it is from that point of view that the demand of Rs. 3,28,000 ought to be reduced and might safely be reduced by a lakh of rupees, and that is the view from which I beg to move that this demand of Rs. 3,28,000 be reduced by Rs. 1,00,000. I do not know if the Government will accept it. I do not think they will, but this is a very reasonable proposition, and I think that this demand should be cut down by Rs. 1,00,000.

Babu AMULYA DHONE ADDY: I have much pleasure in supporting this amendment. It appears from the note which has been circulated to us that there has been an increment of Rs. 3,28,000 in police allowances. The grant for the last year was Rs. 11,09,000 and it is proposed to increase it to Rs. 14,37,000, and it appears from the details that these allowances consist of travelling allowances, house-rent and other allowances. I am not opposed to travelling allowance and house-rent allowance, but it appears to me that the increment which has been suggested is too high. It appears from this note that the amount of salaries of sub-inspectors, head-constables and constables has been increased from Rs. 49,76,000 to Rs. 68,50,000, an increment of Rs. 18,74,000. One of the reasons for this increment is the high prices of food-grains and other necessaries of life, and I beg to submit that it is quite unnecessary to give additional allowances on the very same ground because the additional allowance is for house-rent, etc. I would have objected to the increment of Rs. 3,28,000. However, the amendment which has been suggested by my esteemed friend appears to be very reasonable, because it is suggested that there should be a reduction of the allowances by Rs. 1,00,000.

With these remarks, I beg to support the amendment, and I trust that the Government will be pleased to accept it.

MEMBER in charge of POLICE DEPARTMENT (the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler): There is, perhaps, some not unnatural misunderstanding about the figures, due, partly to the perplexing habit of the Accountant-General in classifying these items in different ways in different

years. But I think if the Council will look more closely into the matter, particularly in the revised budget, they will see that the increase is not so large as the last speakers seem to think, and it is susceptible of explanation.

The items at issue are on page 82 of the budget estimates, and the first is travelling allowance. The total provision proposed under it is Rs. 10,86,000, which the Council will see is the same as the revised estimate, and it is only Rs. 64,000 larger than the budget. The only other item of importance is house-rent and other allowances, which account for Rs. 3,50,000. There, again, if we look at the revised estimates, it is Rs. 3,15,000; so the increment is only Rs. 35,000. The budget figure of under one lakh must be due to classification on a different system. If we look at the accounts for 1919-20, it is evident that there could not possibly be a saving of a lakh in a year.

Now, as regards the details, travelling allowance, as is well known, is not meant to be a source of profit. It is meant to meet the actual expenses which officers have to incur in moving about their charges. Out of the increase shown a sum of Rs. 34,000 is a normal budget figure, that is to say, looking to the strength of the force and past actuals, it is estimated, purely from the budget point of view, that there is likely to be a growth of Rs. 34,000. Another sum of Rs. 30,000 has been added in respect of the travelling allowance of inspectors, which I explained yesterday, namely, that in the place of the old system under which circle inspectors received a fixed allowance of Re. 1 a day, they are in future to be given travelling allowance under the Civil Service Regulations. That is the only new departure in respect of travelling allowance.

The head "Allowances" represents various miscellaneous items, such as house allowances, horse allowances, boat allowances, allowances for steno-typists, special allowances and local allowances, while there are a number of different kinds of allowances given for particular reasons in particular places, and I therefore confine my present remarks to anything which is new in comparison with previous years. I have already referred to one change in the matter of travelling allowance, and I am obliged to Babu Surendra Nath Mullick for drawing our attention to a point, to which he has alluded to-day, namely, that automatically owing to the increase in the pay of sub-inspectors, they would, under the rules of the Civil Service Regulations, be entitled to second class railway travelling allowance in place of intermediate. I have already assured him—and I repeat the assurance now—that we have no intention of allowing that result, which had already been noticed in the office of the Inspector-General, but which had escaped the notice of the Secretariat, and orders will issue restricting sub-inspectors to intermediate railway fare. But I would point out that the increase that is shown in the budget is not based on that particular item.

Apart from this matter of travelling allowances, we have also made a change in the pony and bicycle allowances, to which also Babu Surendra Nath Mullick has referred. We used to give allowances at the rate of Rs. 25 in dear, and Rs. 20 in cheap districts, but in view of the general consensus of opinion that, in the present day conditions, that is not sufficient, we raised that rate to Rs. 30. Of course it is possible to put it lower if we assume that the sub-inspector will feed his pony free and use the chaukidar as a syce, but if this is not to be winked at, it is only reasonable that we should give a man a rate which at present prices is adequate.

The only other change that has been made is in respect of free quarters to inspectors. That also, as I have already mentioned in this Council, is part of the concessions which were given on the analogy of those allowed to the subordinate ranks. Circle inspectors were not previously given free quarters, and we thought it fair to give them either free quarters or allowances in lieu thereof.

These are the only new changes that we have made, and to the extent that they will be operative they account for the increase in the budget figures, and without modifying any of them an economy of Rs. 1,00,000 is not possible under this head.

The motion was then put and lost.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI moved "that the demand for Rs. 50,000 for revision of the pay of the Eastern Frontier Rifles, Dacca, be refused."

I do not wish to take up the time of the Council by repeating the arguments I have already advanced in connection with some proposals of this nature, but I would like to say one word in support of the attitude taken up by me. I know that it is a very unpleasant task to say anything against any proposal for the increment of pay to any class of men in these days. And so I move it only as a *via media* to meet the situation. There is on one side a strong desire that all expenditure in connection with the police should be reduced as far as possible, and on the other side there is practically a strong opposition to any endeavour for cutting down the extravagant expenditure in this department. Over and above the heavy increase over last year's figures there is another sum of over Rs. 10,00,000 under this head, which is no doubt a very heavy demand. There was a proposal for the appointment of a committee to see if any retrenchment is possible and to consider the whole matter thoroughly. If I remember aright, the proposal was that as it was likely to take some time, pending the consideration of the recommendations of the committee, a sum should be granted to carry on the administration. That would have been a position consistent with the words uttered by His Excellency. In the course of the discussion of the motion of my friend Mr. Rhodes, it was said that if we were convinced that such a sum was necessary we should grant it.

There is no proposal, however, that Government would like to consider the situation in fuller details or for appointing a committee asking the Council to elect their representatives. This is a position which I am very sorry to notice, and as I see there is no hope of doing anything, whatever arguments I may advance will be a cry in the wilderness.

I do not wish to take up the time of the Council. If the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler could still see his way to suggest that such a committee should be appointed, I would be perfectly willing to withdraw my motion and I should also be prepared to ask my other friends not to do anything but to wait and see. But as I see the attitude, there is no likelihood of any such thing being done. With this expression of regret I resume my seat. I hope the proposal will be accepted.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri has scarcely alluded to his amendment, but has occupied himself with generalities into which I do not propose to follow him. The amendment is a specific proposal before the Council, and it will really be simplest if we consider whether this specific proposal is justified on its merits or not. I hope to be able to show to the Council that, in this particular instance, the scheme, for which the provision has been made, is of the most modest description. It concerns the betterment of the pay of the Eastern Frontier Rifles stationed at Dacca—a force of 739 men and 78 non-commissioned officers. The pay of sepoys before this change in that battalion because this change is already in force was Rs. 9, as fixed in 1914, and I would ask whether there are any members of this Council who have any domestic servants in their employ at the present day on a pay of Rs. 9. All we propose to do is to give an all-round increment of Rs. 2-8 to the sepoys, bringing up their pay to Rs. 11-8. The ordinary armed constable can rise to Rs. 20, with an allowance of Rs. 2, so we really get these men extraordinarily cheap. Apart from that, another portion of the scheme is to give recruit boys an extra rupee a month, which can scarcely be considered extravagant. Further, we propose a concession to the men in the matter of rations which will be drawn at the rate of Rs. 2-8 a month, while 10 per cent. of the men will draw rations for their families at the same fixed rate of Rs. 2-8, the difference being made good by Government.

These are the proposals, and I venture to think that they are drawn on modest lines. As I mentioned before, they were forced upon us by the action taken by the Assam Government which has allowed precisely the same concessions. We both recruit Jharuas from the same field, and if we do not fall into line in this matter it merely means that either we shall get none, or we shall get inferior men. That is the scheme, and I submit that it is fully justified.

The motion was then put and lost.

Rai MAHENDRA CHANDRA MITRA Bahadur moved "that the demand for Rs. 6,72,000 for the Criminal Investigation Department be reduced by the sum of Rs. 1,50,000."

I find in the Budget estimates the total provision under the head "Police—Criminal Investigation," Rs. 6,72,000. There are two divisions knows as Criminal Investigation Department and Criminal Intelligence Branch. The first division deals with ordinary crimes, such as dacoity, robbery and is in charge of a Deputy Inspector-General, and the other is known as the Criminal Intelligence Department, which deals with political crime. The expenses provided in the Budget estimates being Rs. 6,72,000, I can take for discussion the expenditure of Rs. 3,36,000 for the Criminal Intelligence Branch, which I think is approximately correct. My motion is for the reduction of the expenditure under this particular head.

It appears to me from the perusal of police reports of different years that Government have reduced the establishment of the Intelligence Branch. But in the popular point of view the staff reduced from the Intelligence Branch has not been discharged, but has been transferred to districts. The result is that the number of men remains the same, and the cost also remains the same, only the establishment charges, instead of being drawn from the Criminal Investigation Department head are drawn from the District police head.

Second point. The political condition in Bengal is nowadays far better than that of the other provinces, such as the United Provinces, Central Provinces and Bihar and Orissa. This is evident from the fact that there has been no political crime in Bengal during the last two or three years. If any special measures have been necessary in other provinces, we have no need of it. After the sad experience of the partition agitation, Bengal is comparatively quieter than other provinces, and yet in no other provinces, except Bengal, is so highly paid an officer as a Deputy Inspector-General maintained for political crime. In all other provinces the Deputy Inspector-General for ordinary crime also deals with political crime. If such an arrangement is possible for other provinces, I do not know why a departure is made only here in Bengal. The mattter requires serious consideration. Only a few years ago, a Deputy Inspector-General of the Criminal Investigation Department was in charge of the Railway Police in addition to crime work, but now he has been relieved of Railway Police work by the addition of another Deputy Inspector-General. Here again, let me state that in other provinces, the one and the same Deputy Inspector-General looks after both ordinary and railway crime work. Moreover, Bengal, by separation from Bihar has now been reduced in area and population and the crime work itself must have also very much reduced. But in spite of reduced area and less work and notwithstanding the separation of the Railway Police, Bengal is still maintaining a Deputy Inspector-General for political crime, and my contention, therefore, is that this appointment in

the Intelligence Branch is quite unnecessary and the work can be very easily managed by the Deputy Inspector-General of the Criminal Investigation Department.

I will prove my contention in another way. Although the pay sanctioned is for an officer of the rank of Deputy Inspector-General, yet so far as I can find out the appointment has been held by an officer of junior rank in fact by a junior Superintendent of Police. We are, therefore, paying a high rate of salary to an officer who, by his status and experience, is not entitled to it. In other words, a Deputy Inspector-General is not wanted for this post.

There is another point. From the last issue of the *Calcutta Gazette* I find that a still more junior officer has been appointed as the Deputy Inspector-General of the Intelligence Branch, in addition to his duties as Deputy Commissioner of the Calcutta Police.

The case is then this: you create an appointment with a high salary which has not been found necessary in any other province, and is still less necessary in Bengal, as the work of Deputy Inspector-General of the Criminal Intelligence Branch is much lighter here as I have shown above than in other provinces.

Secondly, you do not find it necessary to fill up the appointment with an officer of proper rank, but fill it up with a junior officer.

Thirdly, you do not now at all fill up that appointment, but ask an officer of the Calcutta Police to look after the work in addition to his own work.

All these facts clearly demonstrate that the appointment is a sinecure. It is further open to the criticism that the post is maintained only to give an officer more money than he deserves. Government can save thus about Rs. 26,000 if this appointment is abolished, the work being transferred to the Deputy Inspector-General of the Criminal Investigation Department.

The abolition of this appointment will not only save the amount spent on pay and allowances but it will make it possible to abolish his staff, to save his costs of travelling expenses and allowance during leave, and the cost of his pension.

From the facts I have given, it is also clear that similarly the staff of other gazetted officers and the police force can now be further reduced. For instance, it has come to my knowledge that the clerical staff in the Intelligence Branch is composed entirely of a special class who draw more than three times the rate of the pay of Indian clerks. In fact, the rates of pay are even higher than the rates allowed to the Inspector-General's own office, although it is an office subordinate to the Inspector-General's office. I cannot find any justification for maintaining such a costly establishment open to a special class of the community at a special rate of pay. If Indian sub-inspectors and Inspectors can be safely entrusted with secret inquiries and have never been found

wanting in duty or unfaithful, as they have sacrificed their lives in devotion to their duty, surely it is an unjustifiable slur on the Indian community not to entrust them with the custody of the papers which these very Indian officers prepare, and appoint a special class of officers at a higher pay for comfortable appointments. In other words, you invite an Indian to die for his service, but you recruit another community when you have something tangible to offer. Is there a single instance in the political history of Bengal in which any officer, excepting an Indian, has sacrificed his life. If you substitute Indian clerks for a particularly favoured community and also reduce the establishment by amalgamating it with the Criminal Investigation Department, you make a considerable saving in cost. I have indicated to the Council the several amounts under the head of staff which can be curtailed. If I cannot touch the amount of Rs. 52,000 which is against the salary of the Deputy Inspector-General, I can show that a large amount can be easily obtainable if the Criminal Intelligence Branch be amalgamated with the Criminal Investigation Department. It is unnecessary for me to specify the amounts, as they can be referred to in the Police Budget of the Criminal Investigation Department. If my premises be correct, that the amount in the Budget is more than what is needed by about Rs. 3,00,000, I believe I am justified in asking the Council to reduce the amount. If I am right in supposing that this office is no longer necessary and can safely be amalgamated with the office of the Criminal Investigation Department, I believe we can cut down at least Rs. 1,25,000 or Rs. 1,50,000. I press for this reduction because, as I have told the Council on several occasions, we must do our best to practise economy. With these words I beg to move the motion which stands in my name.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: Much has been said by the previous speaker and I do not think that it is necessary to say more. I agree with Rai Mahendra Chandra Mitra Bahadur, and I am of opinion that this Criminal Investigation Department is of no special use. The General Department of the Police is quite sufficient to deal with the business entrusted to this department, and further retention of this department to my mind is, to a certain extent, a menace to public peace, if I may be permitted to say so. The department can be safely abolished, but there is a proposal by Government that it should be reduced by only a little over Rs. 2,00,000, while I say more than that may be safely taken out gradually, and gradually we should try to abolish the department altogether and amalgamate it with the duties of the General Department of the Police. With these words only I beg to support the amendment.

Maulvi YAKUINUDDIN AHMED: I beg to support the amendment moved by the preceding speakers. When it was mooted abroad that a special session of the Council was going to be called after His Excellency

Lord Ronaldshay prorogued the last session, those of our countrymen who wanted to convince the people, that the Reforms are fruitless, and invited the people vigorously to non-co-operation and *swaraj*, were loud in their assertions that the whole of the Rs. 23,00,000 which was not vetoed by His Excellency was going to be passed by this Council. The spirit of conciliation and consideration shown by His Excellency has influenced his Councillors and the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler has shown an admirable spirit of conciliation, and the Council are thankful for his concession of about Rs. 60,000 in the grant under the head of allowances to clerks, for pay of higher subordinate executive staff, strengthening of executive police force at Asansol, and for temporary force. The Council must thank the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler and the Hon'ble Mr. Kerr for this considerate mood. Let not the impression gain ground that the Government are going to create in the country a highly paid official class and police, pampered and clothed at an enormous expense, just as the military is pampered and clothed by an aggressive and world-grasping military power on the one hand and a starved, half-naked people in the country on the other—powerless helots, the hewers of wood and drawers of water; let not this Council be supposed to be a party to the rearing up of such an unholy fabric. I rise therefore to support the amendment of Rai Mahendra Chandra Mitra Bahadur. In this year of deficit to grant Rs. 6,72,000 for the Criminal Investigation Department is giving grants to the police by leaps and bounds. The number of police force when large do not have their hands full, and then when they have no work on hand they set to prey upon the very community which they have been set up to protect. Instances not infrequently occur when those who are the protectors of property turn round and become devourers of property, and the Criminal Investigation Department sometimes abuse their powers, and they work upon suspicion and take measures upon information which turn out on many occasions to be untrue. I beg to submit that on the Criminal Investigation Department the expenditure in the previous year was Rs. 6,51,000, and this year, it has been raised to Rs. 6,72,000. Of course the Budget estimate of last year was Rs. 8,50,000, but the revised estimate for 1921-22 was Rs. 6,51,000. This year it has been raised to this figure—Rs. 6,72,000—so it is not a decrease but an increase. Therefore my submission before the House is that in this year of deficit we ought not to exceed the amount that was spent last year, and, as the Rai Bahadur says, that it is for the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler to find the means to decrease the amount by at least the amount which exceeds that spent last year. With these words, I beg to support the amendments moved by Rai Mahendra Chandra Mitra Bahadur and Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri.

Maulvi EKRAMUL HUQ: It was only the other day we reduced the grant under the head police by Rs. 23,00,000, and to-day we are asked to restore nearly an equal amount. Of course those who are

outside the Council look upon the members with a great deal of commiseration, but to my mind, we are doing nothing inconsistent when we consider the matter again. As we know the position we took up at the time of the Budget discussion, it has made this point quite clear, that as we were not in a position to go into all the details, we could not come to a correct conclusion. We waited for the time when the Standing Committee which was going to be formed would be able to supply us with materials to go upon, and we depended upon this body to go over the entire items of police expenditure and advise us as to what we should rightly do. We know that this body is the master of facts and will be able to guide us by their recommendations and decisions, and we feel mostly that that alone will enable us to come to a conclusion as to which items should be cut down, but we find that this body has made no recommendations to the Council, and we stand at the present moment where we were when we were discussing the Budget, with this difference, that some amendments for reduction of certain grants have been made by some members of the Standing Committee, of which some have been withdrawn and some lost. We are again put in darkness, the withdrawal of the motion of the members of the Standing Committee clearly indicates indecision, and we are left to ourselves to decide as best as we could.

Now, so far as the question of the Intelligence Branch is concerned, it has been submitted by the mover that the expenditure under this head has been going up very rapidly and, besides this, while formerly there used to be one branch, namely, the Criminal Investigation Department another branch has sprung up, and it has got a separate staff of its own. Formerly the Criminal Investigation Department had also the Railway Police under it and there was no separate provision for it. At present we find that, besides the Deputy Inspector-General of Crime, there are the Assistant Inspector-General, four Superintendents and a number of inspectors and so on; over and above this in the Intelligence Branch there are one Deputy Inspector-General, two Superintendents, one Assistant Superintendent, three Deputy Superintendents, and so on. I am of opinion that as the crimes which necessitated the establishment of the Intelligence Branch have, to a great extent, ceased, there is absolutely no necessity for two separate departments; these two departments should be amalgamated, and a saving effected under this head. No effort is made to do this, and if we are to pass this resolution, the Government will be compelled to consider the position and find its way to reduce the expenditure under these two heads. With these words I beg to support the amendment.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: Incidentally there is a mistake in the wording of the amendment since the voted grant is Rs. 6,20,000 and not Rs. 6,72,000, the difference being due to the non-voted items to which the Rai Bahadur made a reference, and which, as he

surmises, cover the pay of the Imperial officers, with the result that the pay of the Deputy Inspector-General, to which he has referred, is not included in the vote which is before the Council. But as he has mentioned certain matters connected therewith, I will briefly refer to them. It is true that the officer now holding the post of the Deputy Inspector-General of the Intelligence Branch is a junior officer. The reason is the absolute shortage of men at the present moment. We have not got enough men, and yesterday I mentioned that one of the posts of Superintendent in the District Intelligence Branch is not filled up because we have no officer available. Also, this work being special, it requires some experience in this particular line. An officer may be an excellent police officer in the general way, though not specially fitted for this specialised work. For these reasons a junior officer is now holding the post, but in so far as he combines two duties, there is an economy, as he will not draw the full pay of both posts.

Apart from that, I am not sorry to have this opportunity of making some remarks on this question of the Criminal Intelligence Department, because the whole department is particularly subject to misrepresentation. We hear from Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri that its retention is a menace to the peace of the country, and we frequently see in the press, at least in certain sections of the press, and elsewhere, that all would be peace and happiness if this department were only abolished. It is perhaps not undesirable that the Council should spend a few minutes considering what exactly the work of this department is.

The general criticism that has been made that the expenditure upon it is increasing, is not, I think, justified. If the Council will look at the figures in the budget, they will see that the expenditure in 1919-20 was Rs. 8,83,000; in the budget for 1920-21, it was Rs. 8,50,000, and in the revised budget Rs. 6,51,000, a steady progress downwards. It is true that the budget this year stands at Rs. 6,72,000, but that is only Rs. 21,000 more than the revised, and the difference is due to petty variations from the budget point of view, and not to any departure of policy or innovations. The expenditure, therefore, is downwards, not upwards in a very marked degree.

The Criminal Intelligence Department consists of two main branches, the expenditure on each being approximately accountable for half of the total. That which comes in for most criticism is the Intelligence Branch, and it is that to which Rai Mahendra Chandra Mitra Bahadur has mainly referred, but I shall dwell also on the other side, as we hear so often of the expenditure incurred on the whole as a ground of offence. Now the Intelligence side has been created in the light of actual experience, which surely must weigh more than the *ipse dixits* of a few members who have no knowledge of its working, but who merely say: "We are convinced that it can safely be abolished." Whatever developments have occurred in the Intelligence Branch have been permitted reluctantly in the face

of the actual needs of the situation, and whenever the situation has shown any signs of improvement we have endeavoured to reduce the expenditure. Although in some respects the situation is brighter to-day than unfortunately it was some years ago, can any member who takes the trouble to read his daily papers or keep his eyes open, allege that there are not at the present moment tendencies and forces at work over which it would be criminal for any Government not to exercise a certain amount of watch? If we were to sit here, content to be indifferent as to what is going on around us, we should be guilty of a gross dereliction of duty. But in order to show to the Council that our desire for economy is real, I will give some figures. On the 31st December, 1919, the sanctioned staff was estimated to cost Rs. 3,78,000. The actual staff employed during 1920 cost Rs. 2,55,000, a saving of Rs. 1,23,000. This year we have gone further, and while permitting a sanctioned strength at a cost of Rs. 2,29,000, we are only employing men at a cost of Rs. 1,65,000. The reason for retaining a higher sanction was that we have to be guided by the state of the political atmosphere. On the actual staff employed, however, as compared with the 31st December, 1919, we hope to show a reduction of Rs. 2,13,000, and I venture to hope that these figures are evidence that it is the wish of Government to save money in every possible way in respect of this branch of the administration.

Let us turn now to the other side, as here, again, there appears, to be much ignorance of what actually is done. The main branch on the other side is connected with crime, and it constitutes our sole special agency for complicated investigations in this large province. It consists of one Deputy Inspector-General, one Assistant and one deputy superintendent, with subordinate officers, costing Rs. 1,51,000, while we have had in recent years a temporary section for dacoity at a cost of Rs. 24,000. I will give a few figures on the subject of dacoity. Before the war our annual average of dacoities was 273, as a result of the war and the unrest engendered by economic pressure, these figures went up in a rather alarming way to 871 in 1915, the subsequent statistics being 671 in 1916, 534 in 1917 and 759 in 1918. This slight set-back was not, unfortunately, permanent, but following it, the figures increased to 827, in 1919, and we considered it then necessary to strengthen the department. It will be of interest to Babu Kishori Mohan Chaudhuri to know that his division of Rajshahi was largely responsible for this deplorable result, but we have returned good for evil, and by the efforts of our staff, working particularly in the Rajshahi division, we have knocked off 155 dacoities in the year 1920, that is to say, the figures of the preceding year were 155 higher than last year. We further successfully prosecuted six gangs under sections 400 and 120B, Indian Penal Code, and 60 members of three gangs more are under trial. This is the kind of work to which this department directs its attention, though more still remains to be done.

Now, apart from the investigation of crime, we have other work which could only be controlled in a central office. We have a Finger-print Bureau, consisting of a deputy superintendent and a small staff, costing Rs. 28,000 a year. Most people have a working acquaintance with the finger-print system as elaborated in this province by Sir Edward Henry. The Bureau has records of 175,000 finger prints at the present moment, and the staff is surely not excessive if the requisitions and frequent calls made upon it are to be dealt with. Then there is the Photographic Bureau, which costs Rs. 5,328, in charge of an inspector. It keeps a pleasing picture gallery of some 9,425 criminals, constituting an important development in the control of crime, in which India should not lag behind.

Then we have a Criminal Intelligence Bureau, which keeps the records and history sheets of known professional criminals, and costs Rs. 4,152 a year, and is equally in charge of an inspector. Their records give interesting details of some 23,000 persons, regarding whom they receive requisitions from the districts running into 4 to 5 thousands per annum. I think it will be agreed that this is a reasonable precaution to take in modern times

The next section, which costs Rs. 16,000 is for the supervision of criminal tribes, and comprises a deputy superintendent and four inspectors, with a subordinate staff. Since the introduction of the Act, 96 criminal tribes have been brought under supervision, but against that, at the present moment, there are actually 644 gangs working in this province. We have 4,844 persons registered and subjected to supervision, which, it is to be hoped, will have some effect in curtailing their activities.

Lastly, under this terrible head of the Criminal Intelligence Department we have a useful institution, costing Rs. 6,840, in the detective training school in charge of a deputy superintendent. We have trained in it already some 170 men. That school is conducted at Howrah, and is a most interesting institution; I have no doubt that the officer in charge will be pleased to show it to anybody who cares to visit it. We try to train men in modern detective methods, and although it is a very small beginning, it is much appreciated. When I tell the Council that we have had requisitions from seven or eight other provinces to allow their officers to come to us for training, I think it will be admitted that, in this respect, we are ahead.

That, in brief, gives a sketch of the activities of this department. On the one side it is intended to keep us informed of various movements that are going on about us, and on the other side it is intended to supplement the necessarily less skilled efforts of the district staff by a more highly organised and trained central staff which will afford them assistance in difficult and complicated investigations, while maintaining the records of crime without which no up-to-date Scotland Yard can afford to work at the present time

If my remarks have done anything to dispel much of the misapprehension that obtains about this branch, I shall be more than satisfied, but it will be seen that it follows from what I have said that, apart from economies, already made, we cannot agree to make the large reduction contemplated in these two amendments.

The motion was then put and lost.

Kumar SHIB SHEKHARESWAR RAY: "That the demand for the supplementary grant of Rs. 22,97,700 for expenditure under the head '26—Police' be reduced by Rs. 22,97,699 as per following details:—

26.—A. PRESIDENCY POLICE.

	Rs.
Calcutta Police—	
Sergeants	30,000
Head Constables	15,000
Officers of the Armed Police	7,000
Temporary Force	10,000
Travelling allowances	10,000
Rewards	5,000
Non-contract charges	59,700
Grant to District Charitable Society	4,99,999
River Police—	
Cost of a steamer (three tenths of Rs. 30,000) ...	9,000
Dockyard Police—	
Contingencies (three tenths of Rs. 20,000)	6,000
Police Dead House—	
Contingencies	5,000
Miscellaneous—	
Revision of pay for higher subordinate staff of Calcutta Police	1,50,000
Lump provision	17,000
Total ...	8,23,699

26.—B. SUPERINTENDENCE.

	Rs.
Establishment—	
Clerks	16,000

26.—C. DISTRICT EXECUTIVE FORCE.

Police Force—	
Sub-Inspector	1,00,000
European constables	10,000
Temporary Force	1,00,000

	Rs.
Police Training School—	
Travelling Allowance	5,000
Non-contract charges	10,000
Establishment—	
Clerks	50,000
Launch, boat and elephant establishment	50,000
Travelling allowance	3,00,000
House rent and other allowances	20,000
Contingencies—	
Arms etc.	8,000
Clothing charges	1,00,000
Railway warrants	50,000
Escort charges	2,000
Boat hire	5,000
Purchase of boats and stores for steamer	25,000
Recruiting charges	10,000
Rent, etc	20,000
Rewards	10,000
Non-contract charges	52,000
Miscellaneous—	
Revision of the pay of the higher subordinate executive staff of the Bengal Police	2,75,000
Revision of the pay of the boat establishment ...	40,000
Provision for a new launch	88,000

26.—D. SPECIAL POLICE

Bengal Military Police—	
Provision for revision of Eastern Bengal Police Rifles ...	21,000
Non-contract charges	8,000

26.—E. RAILWAY POLICE

East Indian Railway Police—	
Allowances	15,000
Bengal-Nagpur Railway Police—	
Contingencies	3,000

26.—F. CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION DEPARTMENT

Temporary Establishment	25,000
Temporary Force	25,000
Travelling Allowance	20,000
Rewards	6,000
Non-contract charges	5,000
Total ...	14,74,000

When on the 17th March, Khan Bahadur Wasimuddin moved his amendment for the reduction of the Police demand by Rs. 23 lakhs and odd, he clearly voiced the public feeling that all was not well with the Police Department. The public do not agree with the Government that this department is maintained solely for the benefit of the people. The people feel that it is over-staffed and over-supervised, ill-nourished at the bottom but over-watered at the top. One outstanding feature of the present administration of the Police Department is its lavish prodigality. We find that for the policing of the country alone, that a fourth of its revenues is spent and the expenditure goes on increasing out of all proportions. Does it not signify that this administration has failed in its primary object? Let the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler answer it. Is it statesmanlike? Does it redound to the credit of the Government which must perforce starve the "nation-building" departments to feed the police? The other day the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler said that the Khan Bahadur's was one of the most irresponsible motions supported by irresponsible speeches. After that it has been keenly borne in upon us, and we have been made to realise, that we, the non-official members of the Council, are not responsible for this and other reserved departments. But did the responsible officer think twice before submitting the demand, where the money is to come from? This year, no doubt, we have been able to make two ends meet, simply because we had last year's big balance to fall upon—a balance the major portion of which was earmarked for Education, Sanitation and Agriculture. But next year there would be no earmarked balance to squander. This increased Police demand is going to be recurrent, nay, progressive, if the present system of administration continues. For example, I might point out the case of sergeants. We sanctioned an increase of pay from Rs. 100 to Rs. 125, but the present executive, behind our backs, went a little further and made it Rs. 150 and promised a house allowance of Rs. 90 per head. Now, did the responsible officer give a thought to the funds from which to meet the ever-growing Police demand? Did he ponder over it. Let me ask, shall we or shall we not be held responsible for the fresh taxation which the present policy is sure to lead to, and would or would not such taxation fall upon the people whom we represent here, the people who are under-fed, ill-clad and dying like flies from preventible diseases?

We passed the Khan Bahadur's motion, a very general motion, leaving the responsible officer a wide range to prove his ability and responsibility. Within the limit, we did not like to fetter his discretion. He was given a free scope to adjust and re-arrange, to prove himself a thorough master of his house, able to cope with all circumstances and bring his house into order. But what do we find? He did not even try to meet this modest request of the Council. He did not even make the slightest attempt to realise it into practice. If he had sincerely tried for a few

month to carry out our behests, and then if he had found that funds were insufficient in spite of all possible curtailments, and then if he had come to us for a supplementary grant, we would have been very willing to help him out of the difficulties. We would have sincerely felt with him. That would have been more decent, that would have been more graceful, and that would have meant real mutual co-operation, mutual in the sense so feelingly referred to by His Excellency the other day in this very hall But what do we find in its stead? Even on the 1st of April, before this Budget came into effect, the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler in reply to an inspired question, said: "If effect is given to the vote referred to as it stands, it will be necessary immediately to reduce either the pay or the number of the force, or both." Please mark the word "both." It is the vaguest of vague replies ever heard in the Council and, if I may be allowed to say so, an "irresponsible" reply. Sir Henry does not even apply himself to devise any means; he does not know for certain whether the reduction can be satisfied by reducing the pay, or the staff, or by some other means. The Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler is a responsible officer of the Government; he is surrounded by a host of helping Secretaries; the State papers are before him and it is natural to expect that he is fully cognizant of the facts. But what an irony of fate it is! It is from us that Sir Henry expects that the details of the reduction would be filled in. And what is our position? No details worth the name have been supplied to us. Instead, we are asked to go over to the Hon'ble Mr. Kerr and his colleagues' rooms, pester them with questions, and then the information is to come out in driblets and and be doled out to us individually. As if we, as a body, have nothing to know. We, as a body, may be kept in the dark.

We repeatedly assured Sir Henry and his friends that we are always prepared to co-operate with him, and any reasonable motion by a responsible officer like him would ever receive our respectful consideration. But can we say this motion is a reasonable one? Was there the least necessity of rushing back to the Council in such hot haste for restoration of a demand which we refused only the other day? Rai Bahadur Jogendra Chunder Ghose quoted from May's book on this point yesterday. No constitution in any other country would permit this; no self-respecting body of legislators would tolerate this. But as you yourself said yesterday, that the conditions here are different, we must submit to your ruling.

To me this motion is nothing but a direct insult to our intelligence and sense of public duty. It is nothing short of an attempt at the point of a double-barrelled gun, charged with real and potential bullets of veto and dissolution, to extort a confession from the members themselves that their reduction was wrong, mistaken, or, in more polite words, as used by Mr. Rhodes the other day, "an error of judgment." But I cannot for a moment bring myself to believe that our action was

either irresponsible or unreasonable. I do not care much for the fate of my amendments. Even I do not ask the House to vote for them. I would rather ask the House to vote for Mr. Dutt's motion. I, however, move them solely with a view to place before the House the fact that if an honest effort had been made, that if the idea of a sacrilege committed had not been given currency to, it would have been quite possible to adjust affairs and to carry on the administration without squandering any more money on new fangled schemes of doubtful utility.

It is not possible for any of us to supply fully the details of the workings, but, as a layman, having very little official papers before me, I have only tried to give some idea of possible reduction in the several departments that could be perhaps safely made. A glance at my suggestion will convince that if they be accepted, administration will not be rendered impossible. I think it is preposterous to expect a correct administrative detail from us. We are here to guide the policy of the Government and not to direct the administration in its minutest details. If anything otherwise be expected, the executive, as in all other countries, would better change their seats with us. But perhaps the analogy of other countries does not hold good here. Here we have dyarchy, or, as Mr. Promotho Chaudhuri called it, "*dwya kee*," namely, two little jokes. And our criticisms may be, lightly and with impunity, passed over as idiosyncrasies by the responsible officer of the Government. As I have said that I do not want the vote of the House on this amendment, I need not waste its time by going into the details of my proposals for reduction. But let me repeat again that each of these reductions can be safely made without making the administration in the least impossible.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: This is a somewhat portentous resolution which, on analysis, will be found to differ only from that which succeeds it in so far as the second one proposes the total reduction of the supplementary grant which has been asked for, and this one proposes its reduction by all but Re. 1. But that difference is, to a certain extent, camouflaged by the reproduction of a large mass of detail, the inclusion of which, in the light of the mover's speech, I confess I am not at a loss to understand. Presumably, we may imagine, looking at the agenda paper, that he had reasons for bringing these details before us as justifying his proposal under each head, but he tells us that he has not, that he has taken the items at random, and cannot say whether they are susceptible of reduction. All that he leaves to us. To my mind that is scarcely a fair attitude to assume when laying the resolution in this form before the Council, which naturally gives members grounds for imagining that these heads which are specified have been unduly inflated and are susceptible of economy. But in the light of the frank statement he has made, it seems that he commits himself

in no sense to that position; he has merely casually jotted down these items, possibly in order to give employment to the Government printers. I find myself, therefore, in a position of some difficulty. I have here lengthy notes, on which I myself and the Secretariat have spent many hours, answering each detail. I could go through each item and show that the contention that these heads allow of reduction is not sustainable; but as the Kumar has not treated the Council with sufficient deference to advance any arguments, admitting himself that he has no information, I do not really feel myself justified in taking up the time of the Council in going through the mass of detail which I have here and which I am quite willing to show to any earnest enquirer

Apart from that, the Kumar's speech reduces itself to a *rechauffé* of much that we have heard in the course of these various debates—a general attack on the police and the attitude of Government in relation to the police. I have spoken on that subject so frequently within the course of the last month, that I confess I have nothing new to say about it. I can only refer to the general and detailed arguments which I have been at some pains to adduce in the course of these discussions, and to them there is little that I can now bring forward in addition. The charge of irresponsibility which he has sought to turn upon us is one of somewhat strange seeming to my mind. He confesses in one breath that it is naturally the executive that possesses the information; he confesses in a second breath that he has no information with which to support his detailed suggestions; and then he says that because we, the informed executive, will not at once put into effect his uninformed suggestions to cut our budget down, but dare to say in a short space of time that it is impossible to do so without reducing the pay or the number of the force, or both, then because we promptly give that answer, we are guilty of irresponsibility. Whether the answer is irresponsible or not I care not. All I can say is that it is true, and we are enabled at once to give that answer not by virtue of any occult powers which we may be possessed of, but simply because we are aware of the details of the working of the department and can say offhand that such an economy is not possible. That being so, and as the Kumar has himself stated that he does not propose to put this resolution to the vote, I really do not think that it is requisite for me to occupy the time of the Council any longer than to repeat again that his suggestion is not one which Government are prepared to accept.

The PRESIDENT: Before I put the motion to the House, I ought to point out that an identical motion for reduction by Rs. 1,00,000 in respect of the temporary force was moved and rejected. This item occurs in the present motion also. Therefore, I must reduce the figure of Rs. 22,97,699 by one lakh and put the motion that the demand for the supplementary grant of Rs. 22,97,700 be reduced by a sum of Rs. 21,97,699.

The motion was put and lost.

Babu INDU BHUSHAN DUTTA moved "that the supplementary demand under the head '26 Police' be refused."

I think, Sir that I owe it to this Council to explain in some detail why I have proposed the rejection of the total demand made by the Hon'ble Member in charge. In the course of conversation with some members of this Council yesterday, I found that there was some misconception about —

Sir ASHUTOSH CHAUDHURI: May I rise to a point of order? As this is a resolution that the grant be refused, should it be considered as an amendment?

The PRESIDENT: Yes. Such a motion is provided for in the rules.

Babu INDU BHUSHAN DUTTA: About this matter, and in justice to myself, I must say that I am not moving this amendment in a spirit of sheer bravado or from a desire to prove obstructive to the Government. I have many friends in the Police Department and the fact that I am running the risk of incurring the displeasure of many of them or even the threat of some of them, will convince this House that I am sincere and serious about this matter. I sincerely feel that a serious question of principle and constitutional right is involved in the matter, which it would be a dereliction of duty on our part to ignore. I have discussed this question with leading people of almost all shades of opinion in my constituency of Comilla, and I should be grievously failing in the true discharge of my duties here, if I failed to give vent to the opinion of the people in this matter. It may or may not be that the Government have no constitutional responsibility to us or to the people as far as this and other reserved subjects are concerned, though I should think, that even setting aside the question of constitutional responsibility, not only the Government here but even the Parliament has a serious moral responsibility to the people of this country, which no one can conveniently ignore. The days of irresponsible autocracy or bureaucracy are over. Are we then to attach no value to the statement of our venerable Minister made some time ago that the people had got national government at last?

As I was saying, apart from the question of the responsibility of the Government, we, who have come here as representatives of the people, have a responsibility to the people. We cannot claim the convenience regarding ourselves as an irresponsible body. We have our duties to the people. We must give vent to the wishes of the people. If we have not the courage to say what the people think, what the people feel, what justification can there be for us to continue as members of this Council? The opinion of the people about the present management of the Police Department is not unknown to the Government. The Hon'ble

Sir Henry Wheeler, yesterday, in a manner, deprecated vigorous criticism of the police. I can assure him that I shall not take mean advantage of this debate to criticise the police, though there is justification enough for a vigorous criticism. It is not a pleasant task to have to criticise this department; but I shall only ask the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler one simple question: "Why is it that the police do not get the sympathy and co-operation of the people here?" In England, I have seen from personal experience, that the policeman is regarded as the people's friend. How is it that the public do not regard the police in that light here? Is it because the whole nation has got a vicious mentality or is it because some screw is loose somewhere in the organisation and management of the Police Department? I earnestly request all the members of this Council to seriously consider the question.

Why was it that the lump grant of Rs. 23,00,000 was refused by this Council the other day? As I clearly stated, during the discussion on Mr. Rhodes' motion on the 1st April, as far as I could read the meaning of the vote, it was meant as a censure on the manner in which the department was managed, and also as a protest against the extravagant increase of expense that was being incurred from year to year. Of course, there was the feeling also that in a year of deficit Budget, an economy of a large sum of money was being effected.

How has the position changed since that vote? During the discussion on Mr. Rhodes' motion, it was clearly stated by many of the members of this Council, that if fresh and complete details were furnished and the members were satisfied, then they would be ready to reconsider the matter. As regards this debate, even His Excellency said: "If I have rightly understood them (the speeches), it is your desire to give further consideration to the question of the amount, which you may deem necessary for the proper maintenance of an adequate police force in the light of any further information which the Government may give you." May I ask, in all seriousness, whether this light of information was given to us in time, and now that it has been given to us, is it quite satisfactory to us? Has it removed the darkness? Has it made darkness all the more visible?

First of all, about the great delay in supplying us with the detailed information, a notice of a supplementary Budget, though I cannot understand how this review of an old Budget can be regarded as a supplementary Budget, was sent to us demanding a lump sum of Rs. 22,97,000 and asking us to send in amendments of reduction or refusal by Friday, the 15th April. By that date, we had absolutely no detailed information to guide us. We only knew that the demand was Rs. 35,700 less than the refused grant. We now know, how a clerical mistake nearly made us grant an extra sum of Rs. 35,000, but then, we were absolutely in the dark about the matter. We could not guess whether this item was for the Calcutta Police, or for the Bengal Police, whether for the Dockyard Police, River Police or Railway Police; whether it included

clothing charges, escort charges or whether it included motor cars, horses or even elephants; whether it included rewards or secret service or whether it might not even include an item for taking the Great Eastern Hotel, on lease, for the unmarried sergeants of Calcutta.

In this great confusion of subjects, it was not possible for us to send any details, and I had to send a motion for a total rejection. In my anxiety to know details, I went to a member of the Police Standing Committee, our own representative, for information, and he told me that the details were confidential and that he had been even asked to return the papers supplied to him and he could not show any papers to me. I seriously ask you, Sir, was this the right way of doing things or of trusting us? We have heard much about mutual trust, but is this the way to create trust? The fact that we are here, in spite of violent opposition from certain quarters, is evidence enough that the trust on our part is genuine; but is this the way to return our trust and confidence? Was it not the clear duty of the Government to give us details along with the notice of the motion?

On the morning of the 20th instant, some details were given. But how can we judge of these details? How are we to know which of the items fall under the demand? The details given by the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler total up a sum of about Rs. 44,00,000 and the demand is only Rs. 22,97,000. How are we to know which item is to be included in this lump grant and which is to be excluded? It is quite true, that we refused a lump grant without going into details, but our idea was that the Police Department could be managed even with a reduction of Rs. 23,00,000. The clear duty of the Government, as far as I understand it, was to convince us, by going into the details of the whole department, that the department could not be managed for a smaller sum than the Rs. 1 crore 90 lakhs demanded. The question of the increased grant is not enough, we have got to be satisfied that the whole amount demanded is absolutely necessary for the proper maintenance of an adequate police force. I ask every member of the Council: "Is he perfectly satisfied in his conscience that the Police Department cannot really be managed for a penny less than the sum demanded?" If he is so satisfied let him vote for the demand. I have no quarrel with him; but if he has even a particle of doubt in his mind that the department might be managed more economically, let him pause and consider what serious responsibility he is undertaking by voting this grant and transferring the responsibility on his own shoulders; for it is a great responsibility, indeed.

This brings us to the question of the constitutional principle that I referred to in the earlier portion of my speech. That principle resolves itself into two questions:—

(1) Is this Council fully convinced that the Police Department cannot be managed in any way on any less amount, and that no retrenchment is possible anywhere in the department?

(2) If the answer to the above is in the negative, as I sincerely believe it is, then, has this Council the right to vote for the whole sum and accept the serious responsibility of saying that the amount is necessary for the efficient management of the department?

I submit that this Council has no right to accept this responsibility. We have heard it said that the reserved half of the Government is not responsible to us but to Parliament. I am painfully conscious of the limitations of our power, and I do not wish at this late hour to enter into a dissertation as to why the Budget on reserved subjects was placed under the vote of this Council or whether the power of the restoration of grants was meant to be of usual application or whether this power, though theoretically not unusual, was meant to be applied rarely and with great caution. These are subjects which, every member of this Council, is fully aware of. I give credit to every member to have read the Act, the rules and the Joint Committee's report and I am sure that they know their position only too well. I believe that we have every right in freely exercising our vote on demands of reserved subjects that are placed under our vote and that the Government have accepted some responsibility by placing the demands under our vote. But taking for granted, that the reserved Government have no responsibility to this Council, why, may I ask, should this Council be made to accept a serious transferred responsibility by voting this grant, a responsibility which is not its own? If we vote for this grant to-day, it will naturally be taken to mean, that we, as a Council, are satisfied with the present working of the department and that we have been fully convinced of the necessity of this total expenditure. Is every member of this Council prepared to accept the responsibility of this position? The reserved half of the Government, on their own showing, is responsible to Parliament; if they cannot manage the department for any less amount, let them restore the grant; we have no quarrel with that. But I pertinently put this question to this Council, why should Government be allowed to transfer their responsibility on to our shoulders? Why should we be made to say that the department cannot be managed for any less amount?

I purposely refrain from going into details. This is not an occasion to enter into a detailed discussion of how economy can be effected. I shall do that when I bring in a resolution for the reorganisation of the Police Department; but I may broadly say that I am not for refusing an increase of pay to the inspectors, sub-inspectors and constables. They are our own men; they do the brunt of the work and deserve our sympathy. But it is in the top that retrenchment is necessary. The department is getting top-heavy. If we can give effect to the principle of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, and Indianise the higher police service to a larger extent, great retrenchment and much improvement can be effected.

Then, I have heard it seriously argued, that by agreeing to reconsider the matter, we have in a manner committed ourselves to vote for this grant. This is a curious position to take up, which cannot be justified by events. The Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler said yesterday that "various opinions were expressed by different members to the effect that it would be well if the Council were again given an opportunity to examine the matter in case their previous action was based on a misconception of the facts or a failure to appreciate the full facts." As far as I remember, this was not the view expressed. There was no question of "misconception of facts" or "failure to appreciate the full facts." Our complaint was that the full facts had not been given and that on the facts given, we were not satisfied that the whole demand was necessary. We said that if we were satisfied from fresh materials and detailed facts that the demand was necessary, we would reconsider the question. I submit that we have not been satisfied even to-day of the necessity for the grant; and whatever a few members may have said, the whole Council has the right to view the question with an open mind to-day.

Before I sit down, I again request the members to seriously consider what justification they can have to change their opinion so soon? Can they conscientiously take the responsibility of saying that the whole demand is necessary for the department. Let those shoulder the responsibility, who have the power of restoring the grant; we, who think that there is room for economy and improvement, cannot be asked to bear this heavy responsibility. We cannot be a party to the confession that the longer we live under the present system of Government, the greater becomes the necessity of increasing the police expenditure. I ask this Council: "Are we getting more and more criminal and more and more vicious under the present Government?"

Rai JOCENDRA CHUNDER CHOSE Bahadur: I am glad that you stopped me yesterday. I have thus to-day an opportunity of giving my reasons in full. The reasons which I gave yesterday must have been forgotten by this time. But before I do so, I shall draw attention to a question of practice. You stopped me yesterday, because I was speaking both on the motion and the amendment. Sir Erskine May, in his Parliamentary Practice——

The PRESIDENT: I ruled yesterday that we are guided by our own rules. I held that this supplementary Budget is in order, and I don't think you can discuss that point.

Rai JOCENDRA CHUNDER CHOSE Bahadur: That is not the point. You said that I could not speak both on the motion and the amendment. I believe there is no rule of ours; so we must be guided by the Parliamentary Practice.

The PRESIDENT: You better address yourself to the question before the Council.

Rai JOGENDRA CHUNDER GHOSE Bahadur: I draw attention to page 258 of May's Parliamentary Practice, in which it is clearly laid down that a member can—

The PRESIDENT: I cannot allow you to discuss my ruling.

Rai JOGENDRA CHUNDER GHOSE Bahadur: Then I may say that your ruling is not right. (Cries of "Order, order.") I mentioned to you yesterday that this motion came before us as a supplementary grant, and I showed to you that May's Parliamentary Practice disallows it. Upon that rule I was told that our own rules——

The PRESIDENT: You cannot discuss my ruling. I have already said that the supplementary Budget is in order.

Rai JOGENDRA CHUNDER GHOSE Bahadur: I have got the right of protesting that it is not in order. (Cries of "Order, order.") I oppose this grant on the ground that we, the members of this Council, have no control over the administration of this reserved department. We cannot examine what is necessary and what is not; for example, a popular representative of the Council would like very much to cut down the grant for the Criminal Investigation Department, which many supporters of law and order would disallow. I say this just to show how this matter is entirely in the discretion of the Government. They know best what is right for the preservation of peace and order, and they know best what should be done and should not be done. We do not know what is right and what is necessary, and we shall not take the responsibility upon us to decide what is necessary or not. Sir, when this matter will be made over to us and our Ministers shall have control over it, we shall then take the responsibility; for so long as we have no control over it, we refuse to take any responsibility; for example, I will not reduce the grant of a pair of *dhotis* to a constable or reduce railway fares from second class to intermediate class of sub-inspectors. Well, I know we have no control over the Deputy Inspector-General, the Inspectors of Police, the Deputy Superintendents of Police, the Superintendents of Police, Assistant Commissioners and Deputy Commissioners. The only control we have got is to cut down the *dhotis* of constables or travelling allowances of inspectors. I refuse to take that position. I will not cut down any such thing as long as I have not the power of control over the whole department. Sir, the position is this. The demand for Police is about one-fourth of the entire revenue of Bengal. In Europe, if one-fourth of the revenue of the State is required for military purposes, there is a great row although that country may be surrounded with armed enemies, and here in Bengal we have to spend on the Police about one-fourth of our revenue. That cannot be tolerated. I

oppose this, Sir, on the ground that we may get further political rights and that the evil of dyarchy may be fully exposed. It may be shown that dyarchy is not practical politics. It is for the purpose, if not for any other purpose, that we should oppose this grant and leave it to the Governor to veto and exercise his discretion. He can do so upon very special conditions. He can certify that the expenditure provided by the demand is essential to discharge the responsibility on the subject. The Governor may have to justify his action to the Viceroy and the Secretary of State, and therefore he shall be very careful. We are here to protest that this one-fourth of the revenue of Bengal should never be spent on the police, and this protest of ours shall go to the Viceroy, to the House of Commons, and then the Governor will see whether and how much is to be cut down. It was said by a certain gentleman on the ministerial side that you might have done this by simply reducing the grant by Rs. 100, but I could not do it. I shall therefore take the entire amount of Rs. 23,00,000 as it is and reduce the grant on the ground that this Council protests against this heavy and undue portion of expenditure on the police. Sir, it is said that anybody who goes against this police expenditure goes against peace and order. Sir, we have to learn our constitutional lessons and there should be no timidity in constitutional matters. We are weak, timid and subservient, but weakness, timidity and subserviency never gain for a people political rights. As the Chief Justice said on Tuesday last, we are just learning to "make our hands strong for the strife." Sir, we know what we are and there shall be no fear, no timidity in our demands.

Next, Sir, there is a very important matter. But before I come to that, I must mention one other matter. There are scare-mongers in Parliament, who have said that this position of the police grant is a sign of rebellion. I will tell them that here are men who consider that the maintenance of British rule is essential, indispensable for the protection of their life, property and honour, and not for the exploitation of this country as some gentlemen think it to be. As regards financial conditions, Mr. Lloyd George recently said in England: "we must have economy of the most relentless kind. estimates must be revised with a view to cutting down to the very lowest limits. You cannot economise unless you economise all round to a minimum, which is consistent with national security and national efficiency." He further said: "things which may be all right three years hence, at the present moment are unwise and beyond our means." We asked for an increase of Rs. 23,00,000 over last year's estimate. Much of it, all of it, may be necessary. But can the Government conscientiously tell us that relentless economy has been exercised, and the estimates cut down to the lowest limits, and that the increase, though it may be right three years hence, is not unwise and beyond our means now? As regards the particulars of grant before us, let us remember what Mr. Lloyd George said: "some say, spend nothing on this and on that, but you ought to spend more on this

and that." But "you cannot economise unless you economise all round." I cannot discuss particulars. That is not the right way. Just take the amendment against the increase of the sergeants' pay which was sanctioned last year. The sergeants are being paid the higher salary. How can we reduce it now? When you bring certain particulars before us, we are in a difficult position, but we may say Mr. Lloyd George has said "you cannot economise unles you economise all round." A reduction of one-tenth all round may be made, but a particular item cannot be rejected, that is to say, we may make a reduction of Rs. 18 lakhs from a total of a crore and 80 lakhs. That is our position. It is upon this ground that I say that I oppose this grant.

The PRESIDENT: Your time is up.

Rai JOGENDRA CHUNDER GHOSE Bahadur: Yes, I have finished, Sir.

Rai Sahib NILMANI CHATAK: I heartily support the amendment moved by Mr. Dutta. Sir, it is a question of principle. When in the last meeting the matter was talked out, altough it was not clearly stated, there was an implicit understanding that this Council would reconsider the question on the basis of the report of the Police Committee then elected. We know nothing of its deliberations nor of of its recommendations. Even the proceedings are said to be confidential. But a clue is there. Two of the members of the very Police Committee have brought in the largest number of amendments. Clearly it signifies that they were not satisfied with the facts placed before them Deprived of the guidance which we had expected from the Police Committee, we had to fall back upon Government for assistance in judging of the necessity of the proposed expenditure, but this, such as it was, came too late. At about eight on the eve of this sitting, a paper was handed over to us, at a time when we had very little leisure to deliberate and ponder over the detailed items set in there. If it was the intention of Government to circulate such a paper, it should surely have been done before the last date fixed for sending in the amendments. And, Sir, we are now placed in a very difficult position. The whole matter is done elsewhere. The Executive promises revisions of pay, house-allowances, *ad interim* allowances and what not. But when the question of funds come, we are asked to vote on insufficient information and the threat of utter dislocation of administration, subversion of discipline among the men and officers and even a general cessation of work is held out, and we are practically coerced into sanctioning the demands. Sir, this is hardly responsible government. We are responsible to our electorate; we are to look after their interests first, and we cannot therefore agree to the expenditure until we are convinced of its necessity.

Sir, I think no further light has been thrown on the matter at issue to necessitate the passing of a supplementary budget at such an early date and so soon after the rejection of the same. The grant already voted is sufficient to carry on the Police Department until we have had time to satisfy ourselves of the necessity of the additional grant asked for, and there appears to be no reason why an attempt should be made to push the matter through in hot haste. We are also curious to know why we cannot get the advantage of the views of the Police Committee which was appointed for the express purpose of assisting the Council in properly estimating the needs of the administration.

Dr. JATINDRA NATH MAITRA: I rise to support the motion of Babu Indu Bhushan Dutta. Sir, we have come to this Council to protect the interests of the several millions of our countrymen, many of whom know not what a full meal is. It must be our bounden duty to look to their interests first regarding the retrenchment of expenditure whenever and wherever possible, this year in particular, when we are working at a deficit.

I realise, Sir, that revision of pay and allowances has been done in several departments already and some have thought that it would be in the fitness of things that the Police Department should also have adequate consideration at the hands of this Council. Sir, if our countrymen found, in past years, that the Police Department deserved our sympathy and kindness, this feeling would never have arisen. It is an open secret that our people respect the police more out of fear of mischief than out of love and reverence. And what is the cause? Few people can remember incidents in their daily life where the services of the police had been greatly appreciated, but many people do remember instances where untold miseries and hardships were the outcome of police interference. This, in my humble opinion, is the root-cause of the general feeling against the Department and Government ought not to accuse those who do not feel inclined to enhance the emoluments of the police at present.

Sir, it has been said that unless this demand is granted, the Police Department will not work properly. This, I should think, is a gratuitous insult to the Police Department by their own patrons. Does the Government believe that formerly when the salaries of their departments were not increased they lacked in the ardour of their work, and can the Governmant now guarantee that the machinery of the Police Department will work exceedingly smoothly if the provision in the Budget is sanctioned. No councillor will find fault with Government if the Government adequately reward the efficient officers of the department from time to time, but punish the delinquents and laggards when occasion arises. In other words, the quality of the work should be the sole test of their future promotions and rewards, and our country, however poor, will gladly co-operate with the Government to further this end. But as

the matter stands at present, the public are not at all enamoured of the Police Department and they have sufficient reasons to differ from the view point of the Government in this connection, and consequently we, the representatives of the people, regret that no case has been made out to convince us to sanction the present demand of a huge sum which would better be spent in dealing with measures of public health and other cognate subjects in future.

Sir, if the Government really want the people to see eye to eye with them in this matter in future, the Police Department should realise that they are really the servants of the public - not in theory, but in practice, and not as at present the practical demonstrators of the will of the bureaucracy.

Maulvi RAFI UDDIN AHMED: I extremely regret that I have to oppose the amendment. Were this amendment to pass, there was absolutely no necessity of spending our energies and the public time during the last two days. Besides, Sir, when we last voted for reduction, we were quite in the dark as to the detailed account of the Police Budget, and I for myself naturally thought that this reduction of Rs. 23,00,000 was to be shared by the entire police expenditure. But now, curiously though I find that the oily heads have been already over-oiled and the most unfortunate creatures have been left unfed. In these days of scarcity when the Government is kind to all its other subordinates, we naturally expect that it should be so to these unfortunate creatures also. Besides, they are our own countrymen and are protectors of our lives and property. The poor creatures are worse off than the menials of other departments. Even the menials are allowed to live with their wives and children and all together share the miseries of life. But the constables are sometimes kept over more than five or six years away from their families, and I know that some of the constables have but one meal per day. Is it too much to think if they prey upon the people for their self-gratification? Of course, I do not support this. But I pray Government to pay them more just to save us from their oppression and keep them above starvation. With these words I beg to oppose this amendment.

Sir ASHUTOSH CHAUDHURI: Unfortunately I could not attend the debate on this matter when it was first before the House. But I have heard as to what happened on that occasion. There were specific amendments which were withdrawn and a resolution was brought forward disallowing a large sum of money, that is the sum which is now before us for grant. It was apparent that no one, when the matter was discussed, had applied his mind as to what the particular requirements were. They gave up the special amendments and voted against a lump sum by way of grant. Now the matter is again before the House and, if I may say so, it is properly before the House. We must accept that position. I have been looking through the rules of the Budget and find that section 94

provides that a matter of this character may be brought before the House. One of the members has said that the system of dyarchy is responsible for this. It may or it may not be so. But when we are in this House we must accept the constitution as it is and therefore our work must be upon the constitution as it is so long as it remains so. We may point out outside, or we may show from the proceedings here, that the scheme is not a workable one and requires amendment, but so long as we are here we ought to accept the position that it is the constitution.

Sir, so far as the matter before us is now concerned, I feel that particulars have now been given to us. It is not necessary to wade through a mass of irrelevancies to approach this matter. The facts are there, the figures are there, and we ought to discuss this grant and try to understand what is wanted and what we can legitimately give. It is quite true that the police as a body is not liked in this country. It does not enjoy a good reputation. It is quite true that we have a serious grievance so far as the Police Department is concerned, and it is quite true that out of a net revenue of 8 crores of rupees, so far as this province is concerned, two crores of rupees go to the police, which to an ordinary individual, is an enormous charge, namely, 25 per cent. of the whole of our income goes to the police. But the police has to do work work which we know cannot be done without a large number of men. We know also that we have been struggling for many years to increase the pay of the police and make them efficient. It has been felt absolutely necessary that their pay should be increased, and we know now from the figures given to us that Rs. 18,00,000 out of the sum which is required are to go to our poor sub-inspectors, head-constables and constables. There are only Rs. 10,000 which go to the European police. We have got these figures and therefore I ask the House to consider and determine the matter from that standpoint.

I quite sympathise with my friend, Babu Surendra Nath Ray, in his trials and tribulations. He reminded me of the story of Japhet in search of his father. One would not like to be in that position. He went from A to B and from B to C and C to D to get some information. At last he went to Sir Henry Wheeler, and from him also he did not get much information, as he told us. We quite sympathise with him, but so far as this matter is concerned we have the details and are now in a position to judge for ourselves. Materials have been placed before us to consider and we should consider them.

Babu KISHORI MOHAN CHAUDHURI: I do not think I should be silent in this debate. The position is a very awkward one for me at least. On one side the demand is that the full amount of Rs. 22,00,000 be voted, while on the other that the whole amount be refused. As a representative of the people I explained my situation that I cannot support Government in entirety. I have a duty to my constituents, and I think I shall fail in it if I support the Government view that the full amount should be

voted. Crime has increased in my division, but to my mind the explanation is that it is due to the inability of the police to detect the crime or to some other causes. For example the system is not very proper. Now-a-days selection is made upon recommendation and favouritism and consideration of ability is scarcely insisted upon. There is another difficulty: the public generally avoid the police: they cannot trust the police: somehow or other they are under the impression that if they approach the police there will be some difficulty on their part. So only the interested few are very friendly with them, but the generality of the people are not in sympathy with them. However, whatever those causes may be, it is certain that the rapid increase in the police expenditure ought to be checked, and I think the desire is reasonable. So, if I now sit silent, that would be a position rather inconsistent. It would be simply supporting Government with a silent vote and, as I explained my situation, I do not think I can do it with a clear conscience. There is, however, some difficulty on my part to support the motion that the whole demand should be refused, but if I do so I can do so only as a protest against, to my mind, the unreasonable demand of Government. Though I do not agree that the whole sum should be refused, still, if I support the motion, I will be able to go back with a clear conscience without detriment to any responsibility to my constituents. Again as a representative of this Council on the Police Standing Committee, my position is also a very difficult one. We cannot disclose or even we cannot give out to the members what deliberations we had. But I can say this—that my attitude towards this demand has been made abundantly clear that I cannot fully support Government in its demand. So if I support the motion—as I say by way of protest—I will do so with a clear conscience and there will be no liability to my constituents. I therefore decide, under these circumstances, though rather reluctantly, to support the motion.

Mr. SYED NASIM ALI: I have been listening to the discussions regarding the supplementary Budget since yesterday, and really at the very beginning, I could not make up my mind as to what I should do in connection with this matter. But after all the motions—I mean the previous motions—have been discussed and after the Council has decided what should be done with regard to those amendments, it seems to me that the present motion is just like a Kantian formula—a form without matter. We all know that it is a very vague motion and the motion is to the effect that the whole amount be refused. But on what grounds? That is the question which one puts to himself. We are in the Council not simply to deliver speeches, not simply to give vent to our feelings and sentiments, but we have come here to transact business, and like businessmen we have got to do this. One question that strikes me is this: Supposing we carry this amendment and the whole amount is refused, what would be the effect? I have not heard any member suggesting this, that if you refuse this there will be no risk. Let the member

think over the matter; if this police grant be refused what would be its effect upon the police officers? One member suggested that the Government ought to know that it can control its own officers, but we know that outside the Council there are many influences at work; there are many movements going on and these movements are going on not in this province only, not in this country only, but throughout the whole world. Therefore the position is this: Supposing we refuse this grant, what would be the effect? Supposing the police officers who expect some betterment—some increase in their pay and allowances venture to go on strike for two months, I put it to the Council what inevitable result would follow from that? Has anybody conceived it? We have experience about the strike of the tramwaymen, the strike of the mill people, but let us imagine for one moment the strike of police officers the result of which we shudder even to dream. Again I remind the House we have come to this Council to transact business and we must act like businessmen and we should not be guided by sentiments or feelings. No doubt the voice of the people of the province is that we must curtail our expenditure as much as possible. But, Sir, when we have come to the Council here to make the reforms a success by constitutional means, by gradual evolution, and not by revolution, certainly it is our first duty to see that there must be preservation of peace and order, and I think if we want this we must carefully think before we try to dissatisfy the police.

That is, of course, one consideration. Let us go to the other side of the question. If any gentleman of this Council asks me to support this motion, he will have to say why I should support it he will have to show why he wants a reduction under all its particular heads. I find here that A *plus* B *plus* C *plus* D *plus* E makes X. Various details have been given and several amendments asked for a reduction of expenditure under several detailed heads, and when I read all the amendments, I thought that the members of the Council must have gone through the whole supplementary budget and must have thought that these were the only items which were possibly objectionable. But after discussing all the amendments, head by head, item by item, what conclusion have we arrived at? Our conclusion is that we must not cut down these items. As this matter has been discussed item by item and all the amendments have been negatived, on what other particular items we want a reduction now I fail to understand. It is now just like the empty formula of philosopher Kant—form without matter. Certainly I am not an abstruse philosopher like Kant. This motion is just like saying, "Don't reduce this head, don't reduce that head, but reduce the whole thing." It seems to me very arbitrary and it does not stand to reason how without being able to refuse each particular item I am in a position to say conscientiously that the whole thing should be refused. These items have been thoroughly examined and each member has said what he had to say. And I fail to understand how I can now conscientiously,

without a clear and definite idea of my own, support this particular motion. If I have to support this motion without reference to any particular item, I will have to support it blindly without knowing the reasons for so doing. I had a conversation about half an hour ago with one of the supporters of this motion, and I wanted to know his arguments. I told him that if he could convince me of the reasonableness of refusing the demand, I would certainly be with him. He told me that his only reason was that the Council once refused it and for the sake of the honour and prestige of the Council we must support the motion. I cannot be a blind follower like that. Simply because we refused it on the last occasion, therefore without any rhyme or reason and without doing justice to my conscience, simply to keep the prestige and the honour of the Council (as if the Council is not liable to make any mistake) we should not support the motion. What I beg to submit in this connection is that before we decide as to what to do in this matter we must make our ideas clear and definite and we must be thoroughly satisfied that we want reduction on all its particular heads, and it is after that only that we can conscientiously vote for or against it.

Rai HARENDRANATH CHAUDHURI: I feel I cannot but support the motion that has been moved by my friend, Babu Indu Bhushan Dutta, and in doing so, I think I ought to explain my position. I am one of those who, in connection with the discussion on Mr. Rhodes' motion, expressed the view, that if the Standing Committee approved of the additional grant, then we should be prepared to consider this supplementary budget. But here there is nothing to show what view the Standing Committee has taken and whether in their opinion this additional grant is absolutely necessary. Hence I beg to say that when the condition on which we agreed to reconsider this proposal has not been satisfied I am not prepared to go back upon my original vote. Moreover, two things of importance have come to pass since the discussion on Mr. Rhodes' motion which have made us reconsider our position—the first is the statement made by His Excellency the Governor and the second the discussion in the House of Commons which we have come to know of late. From the statement of His Excellency the Governor we have come to know that his power to restore refused or reduced grants is not confined only to exceptional circumstances or extraordinary cases, but that his idea is he can exercise that power even in normal conditions and ordinary cases. And what have we learnt from the discussion in the House of Commons? It is this: That the Secretary of State for India has been pleased to say in answer to questions from the members for East Sussex and Leicestershire, that he leaves the matter to His Excellency the Governor. Under these circumstances, I do think that we should not and need not gratuitously take upon ourselves the responsibility of voting this additional grant.

But I cannot take my seat without replying to the point raised by Mr. Syed Nasim Ali. Mr. Nasim Ali says that this motion is like the Kantian form, without matter. I beg to remind my friend, Mr. Nasim Ali, a student of Kantian philosophy as he is, that he should not look for the matter to the same source to which he is to look for the form. The form, however, is none the less real nor of less value for that.

With these remarks I take my seat.

Mr. TARIT BHUSAN ROY: I regret that I have to oppose the motion of my friend, Babu Indu Bhushan Dutta. I may tell this Council the circumstances which have led me to this course. My friend, Babu Indu Bhushan Dutta's motion is to the effect that the entire demand be refused. My submission to the Council is that this motion is impracticable and that no effect can be given to the motion in this form, having regard to the fact that this Council only yesterday and to-day have negatived certain other motions relating to the items which make up this entire demand. What will happen if my friend's motion is now accepted by the Council? My friend's motion is to the effect that the entire sum be disallowed, but this Council has resolved that a portion of this demand should be allowed. Therefore my submission is that the motion of my friend in the present form is such that no effect could be given to it even if it is carried.

Babu INDU BHOSHAN DUTTA: May I rise to a point of order? My motion does not contain any details.

The PRESIDENT: That is quite clear: the List of Business shows that.

Mr. TARIT BHUSAN ROY: My friend, Babu Indu Bhushan Dutta, has made quite a forcible speech in commending his motion to the acceptance of the Council. I will not for one single moment conceal the fact that it is the public impression that the police in the country is extremely unpopular. Even so far ago as 1901 no less an authority than Sir John Woodburn had characterised the police as tyrannical and dishonest. My object in opposing the motion is this: Are we justified now, having induced the Government by assurances, to make this supplementary demand shall we be justified now in refusing this grant? My friend behind me asks as to who has given that assurance. I have heard a report that an assurance was given by my friend, Babu Surendra Nath Ray, and that he had even led a deputation which had waited upon His Excellency in this respect. My friend will please contradict me if I am not correct. One of the grievances which we made upon the motion of my friend, Mr. Rhodes, was that on the last occasion, when we came to a decision, sufficient details had not been given to us, and the view was also expressed—the hope was also expressed—in clear and unmistakable language, that we should await the decision of our Standing Committee in coming to a conclusion on this occasion. But is it not the fact that the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler, representing the Government—the

Executive—has furnished us with the details? What is it that has precluded our chosen representatives, who formed members of the Standing Committee, from submitting any statement or recommendations to this Council? In the absence of these details from our own representatives, have we any other choice except that we should accept the demand made by the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler? Who is it that has placed a gag upon the mouth of our representatives? They were at perfect liberty to make any statements they pleased with regard to this demand, but they have not chosen to do so. I do not know why they have done so. I asked some of my friends who were members of the Standing Committee as to what was it that had induced them to keep quiet on this matter, but they said that the proceedings of the Standing Committee were confidential. Well, it has been said—and often said—that the Members of the Executive—of the Indian Civil Service—are so many autocrats, they are sun-dried bureaucrats; but here, in this instance, they have given us particulars, they have given us details, but our own countrymen—our own chosen representatives—have not ventured to come forward before us and redeem the pledge which was given to us on the last occasion upon the discussion over the motion of my friend, Mr. Rhodes. Speaking for myself I do not think it is open to us now at this stage, after the details have been placed before us, to reject the demand which has been made, and having regard particularly to the fact that our own representatives have not placed any facts or details before us on this point although pressed to do so.

Mr. F. A. LARMOUR: I move that the question be now put.

The Hon'ble Sir HENRY WHEELER: Usually, doubtless, the Member in charge would reply, but as it is clear that the merits of the question have been thoroughly discussed, and as there is nothing new that I can say, I do not propose to speak further.

The question that the question be put was put and agreed to.

Babu Indu Bhushan Dutta's motion was then put and a division taken with the following result:—

AYES.

Ahmed, Khan Bahadur Maulvi Wasimuddin.
Ahmed, Munshi Jafar.
Ali, Maulvi A. H. M Wazir.
Ali, Munshi Amir.
Ali, Munshi Ayub.
Arhamuddin, Maulvi Khandakar.
Bhattacharji, Babu Hem Chandra.
Chaudhuri, Babu Kisheri Mohan.
Chaudhuri, Khan Bahadur Maulvi Nazar Rahman.
Chaudhuri, Rai Narendranath.
Dutta, Babu Indu Bhushan.
Ghatak, Rai Sahib Nitmani.
Ghose, Rai Bahadur Jogendra Chunder.
Haq, Shah Syed Emdadul.
Huq, Maulvi Ekramul.
Janah, Babu Sarat Chandra.
Khan Maulvi Hamid-ud-din.
Maitra, Dr. Jatindra Nath.
Makramali, Munshi.
Mitra, Rai Bahadur Mahendra Chandra.
Mukharji, Babu Satish Chandra.
Mukhopadhaya, Babu Sarat Chandra.
Nasker, Babu Hem Chandra.
Pahlowan, Maulvi Md. Abdul Jubbar.
Ray, Babu Bhabendra Chandra.
Ray, Kumar Shib Shekhareswar.
Ray Chaudhuri, Babu Brojendra Kisher.

NOES.

Addy, Babu Amulya Dhone.
Ahmed, Maulvi Azaharuddin.
Ahmed, Maulvi Rafi Uddin.
Ali, Maulvi Syed Mukseed.
Ali, Mr. Syed Nasim.
Banerjea, the Hon'ble Sir Surendra Nath.
Birla, Babu Chaneshyamdas.
Birley, Mr. L.
Bompas, Mr. C. H.
Bose, Mr. S. M.
Cathcart, Mr. M.
Chaudhuri, the Hon'ble the Nawab Saiyid Nawab Ali, Khan Bahadur.
Cochran, Mr. A.
Cohen, Mr. D. J.
Das, Babu Shishmadev.
Das, Mr. S. R.
Dey, Mr. C. C.
Donald, Mr. J.
Farequi, K. C. M.
Gordon, Mr. A. D.
Gupta, Mr. N. B.
Hornell, Mr. W. W.
Jamas, Mr. R. H. L. Langford.
Kerr, the Hon'ble Mr. J. H.
Khan, Babu Devendra Lal.
Khan, Maulvi Md. Rafique Uddin.
Khan, Mr. Razaur Rahman.
Lang, Mr. J.
Larmour, Mr. F. A.
Lees, Mr. D. H.
Marr, Mr. A.
McKenzie, Mr. D. P.
Mitter, the Hon'ble Mr. P. C.
Morgan, Mr. D.
Mukherjee, Babu Nitya Dhon.
Mukherji, Professor S. C.
Mullick, Babu Nirode Behary.
Mullick, Babu Surendra Nath.
Nakey, Mirza Muhammad Ali.
O'Malley, Mr. L. S. S.
O'Kinealy Lt.-Col. Frederick.
Poddar, Babu Keshoram.
Pugh, Colonel A. J.
Payne, Mr. C. F.
Raheem, Mr. Abdur.
Rahim, the Hon'ble Sir Abdur.
Ray, Babu Surendra Nath.
Ray Choudhury, Raja Manmatha Nath.
Rhodes, Mr. C. W.
Roy, Babu Jogendra Nath.
Roy, Mr. Tarit Bhusan.
Sarkar, Babu Jogesh Chandra.
Sinha, Babu Surendra Nareyan.
Stark, Mr. H. A.
Suhrawardy, Dr. A.
Suhrawerdy, Dr. Hassen.
Suhrawardy, Mr. H. S.
Swan, Mr. J. A. L.
Watson-Smyth, Mr. R. M.
Wheeler, the Hon'ble Sir Henry.
Wordsworth, Mr. W. C.

The Ayes being 27 and the Noes 61, the motion was lost.

Babu SURENDRA NATH MULLICK: In view of the fact that the amount of Rs. 4,20,000 proposed to be deducted by this motion of mine has already been disallowed in my previous motions, I do not think it proper any longer to move my next amendment, particularly in view of the extra loyalist proclivities of many of my friends here since yesterday for reasons and influences to which I need not refer.

The following motion was then, by leave of the Council, withdrawn: "That the supplementary demand under '26 Police' be reduced by Rs. 4,20,000."

The original motion of the Hon'ble Sir Henry Wheeler that the supplementary grant under the head "26 Police," as amended in Council, be given was then put and agreed to.

Prorogation.

The Secretary to the Council then handed to the President a notification by His Excellency the Governor of Bengal proroguing the Council which the President read out to the members.

The notification was as follows:—No. 1217L., date the 21st April, 1921. In exercise of the power conferred by section 72B, sub-section (2) of the Government of India Act, His Excellency the Governor is pleased to declare that at the conclusion of the meeting on the 21st April, 1921, the Bengal Legislative Council stands prorogued.

The members then dispersed.

B. R. Press—19-A-1921—416J—1,500—F. T. R.

INDEX

TO

THE BENGAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS.

(Official Report.)

VOLUME II.—SECOND SESSION.

April 20th and 21st, 1921.

Addy, Babu Amulya Dhone

Demands for allowances for the District Executive Police force, 47.

Reorganisation of the Town Police, 24-Parganas, 34

Adjournment, 45.

Ahmed, Maulvi Rafi Uddin

Grant, Supplemenatry, "26—Police," 74.

Ahmed, Maulvi Yakuinuddin

Demands for Criminal Investigation Department, 53

Ali, Mr. Syed Nasim

Grant, Supplementary, "26—Police," 76

Asansol

Demand for emergency police, 42

Certificates

Under proviso (*b*) to section 72D (*2*) of the Government of India Act, 1

Chairmen

Constitution of a panel of, 1.

Chaudhuri, Babu Kishori Mohan

Demands for clothing charges of Police officers, 26

Demands for Criminal Investigation Department, 53

Demands for Emergency Police force (Asansol), 41.

Chaudhuri, Babu Kishori Mohan

Demands for revision of the pay of Eastern Frontier Rifles, 49

Demands for "temporary police force," 43

Grant, Supplementary, "26—Police," 8

Pay of the executive staff, Bengal Police, 27

Reduction of *ad interim* allowances to Police force, 24

Reduction of police grant, 13, 23

Reorganisation of the Town Police, Hooghly, 40

24-Parganas, 33.

Chaudhuri, Rai Harendranath

Grant, Supplementary, "26—Police," 78

Chaudhuri, Sir Asutosh

Grant, Supplementary "26—Police," 74

Nomination on the panel of Chairmen, 1

Rose to a point of order, 65

Demands for

Criminal Investigation Department, 51

Revision of pay of Eastern Frontier Rifles, 49

Supplementary grant, "26—Police," 3

Supplementary grant, under head "22—General Administration," 2

Temporary Police force, 43.

Division, 80.

Dutta, Babu Indu Bhushan

Rose to a point of order, 79.
Supplementary demand, "26—Police," 65.

Emergency Police force at Asansol

Demands for, 41.

Ghatak, Rai Sahib Nilmani

Grants, Supplementary, "26—Police," 72.

Ghose, Mr. D. C.

Reduction of Police grant, 17.

Ghose, Rai Bahadur Jogendra Chunder

Grant, Supplementary, "26—Police," 70.
Reduction of Police grant, 18.

Government of India Act

Certificates by Governor and expenditure authorised under proviso (*b*) to section 72D (2), 1.

Governor

Restoration of grants by, 1

Grants, Supplementary

"26—Police," 3
Rent of Town Hall for Legislative Council Chamber and alterations and fittings thereto, 2

Haq, Maulvi A. K. Fazl-ul

Nomination on the panel of Chairmen, 1

Hooghly

Reorganisation of the Town Police of, 40.

Huq, Maulvi Ekramul

Demands for Criminal Investigation Department, 54

James, Mr. R. H. L. Langford

Reorganisation of the Town Police, 24-Parganas, 35.

Kerr, the Hon'ble Mr.

Statement of expenditure authorised by Governor, 1.

Mallik, Babu Surendra Nath

Demand for "allowances" for the District Executive Police force, 46.
Grant, Supplementary, "26—Police," 81.
Reduction of Police grant, 12.
Reorganisation of the Town Police, Hooghly, 40.
Reorganisation of the Town Police, 24-Parganas, 29.

Midnapore

Partition expenditure authorised, 2

Mitra, Rai Bahadur Mahendra Chandra

Demand for Criminal Investigation Department, 51.
Demand for emergency police force (Asansol), 41.
Reduction of *ad interim* allowances, 25

Moitra, Dr. Jatindra Nath

Grant, Supplementary, "26—Police," 73

Motions for Supplementary grants

"22—General Administration," 2
"26—Police," 3

Mymensingh

Partition expenditure authorised, 2

Pal, Rai Bahadur Radha Charan

Nomination on the panel of Chairmen, 1.

Panel of Chairmen

Appointment of, 1

President

10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 33, 34, 39, 40, 41, 45, 46, 64, 65, 69, 70, 72, 79.

Prorogation, 8

Ray, Babu Bhabendra Chandra

Demand for emergency police force (Asansol), 42
Reorganisation of the Town Police, 24-Parganas, 37.

Ray, Babu Surendra Nath

Reduction of Police grant, 16.

Ray, Kumar Shib Shekhareswar

Demand for Supplementary grant, "26—Police," 59.

Reduction of

Demand for *ad interim* allowances to clerks under "Superintendence" and "Establishment," 24.

Pay of officers, Bengal Police, 27.

Reorganisation of the Town Police

Hooghly, 40.

24-Parganas, 29.

Roy, Mr. Tarit Bhusan

Grant, Supplementary, "26—Police," 79.

Put question, 15.

Rose to a point of order, 13.

Town Hall.

Rent for Legislative Council Chamber, 2.

Watson-Smyth, Mr. R. M.

Nomination on the panel of Chairmen, 1.

Wheeler, the Hon'ble Sir Henry

Ad interim allowances to Police officers, 25.

Demand for "Allowances" for the District Executive Police force, 47.

Wheeler, the Hon'ble Sir Henry

Demand for clothing charges of the Police officers, 27.

Demand for Criminal Investigation Department, 55.

Demand for emergency police force (Asansol), 42.

Demand for revision of pay of Eastern Frontier Rifles, 50.

Demand for Supplementary grant, "26—Police," 63, 80.

Demand for "Temporary force," 43.

Pay of the executive staff, Bengal Police, 28.

Rent of Town Hall for Legislative Council Chamber, 2.

Reorganisation of the Town Police, Hooghly, 40.

Reorganisation of the Town Police, 24-Parganas, 29, 37.

Supplementary General Administration grant, 2.

Supplementary Police grant, 3, 21.

24-Parganas

Reorganisation of the Town Police of, 40.

P. S. Press—24.2.1922—3259J—2,006—A. F. L.